



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2005

No. 6

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 26, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord our God, rooted in Your covenant of promise and fulfillment, Your people live by faith.

Because we can recall all the benefits received in the past, we are all the more confident of Your presence with us now and Your guidance of us into the future.

May all the undertakings of this 109th Congress of the United States of America, and the laws that are made by this body, be firmly established in a total commitment to be faithful public servants and transparent leaders of compassion and fidelity, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHOCOLA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COLERAIN HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the Cincinnati Bengals once again will not be in the Super Bowl this year. Maybe next year. But Cincinnati is blessed with some of the best high school football in the Nation. In fact, for the last 3 years in a row the Ohio State champs have been from my district, from Cincinnati, twice Elder, and now Colerain High School. What a team. They so dominated this year that they went undefeated 15 and zero, and in the final playoff game defeated arguably the second best team in the State by 40 points, and on the rival's home field.

So often we hear that a team's character is a reflection of its head coach. Never before has this statement been so true. Dedication, tenacity, and heart are all words that come to mind when describing Head Coach Kerry Coombs. In his 13 years at the helm, Coach Coombs has not only built one of the most successful high school programs in the country; more importantly, he has positively influenced the lives of countless young men.

So congratulations to Colerain's players, coaches, students, parents, and fans. You have made us all proud.

URGENT NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO PREVENT WIDE-SCALE LOSS OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC DESTRUCTION AT HOME AND ABROAD

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to view the devastation in Southeast Asia as a result of the tsunami. As appalled as I was by what I saw, I must confess that occasionally my thoughts drifted back to the United States. What would have happened if last September, Hurricane Ivan had veered 40 miles to the west, devastating the city of New Orleans? One likely scenario would have had a tsunami-like 30-foot wall of water hitting the city, causing thousands of deaths and \$100 billion in damage.

The city has always been at risk because of its low-lying location, but that risk has been increased because of rising sea levels, groundwater pumping and the erosion of coastal Louisiana. Twenty-four square miles of wetland disappear every year, since the 1930s an area one and a half times the size of Rhode Island washed away.

Considering the reaction of the American public to the loss of a dozen people in the recent mud slides in California, it is hard to imagine what would happen if a disaster of that magnitude hit the United States.

The experience of Southeast Asia should convince us all of the urgent need for congressional action to prevent wide-scale loss of life and economic destruction at home and abroad. Prevention and planning will pay off. Maybe the devastation will encourage us to act before disaster strikes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H199

ELECTION OF MAJORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 48) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 48

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Boehner; Mr. Pombo; Mr. Everett; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Jenkins; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Hayes; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Pence; Mr. Graves; Mr. Bonner; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mr. King of Iowa; Mrs. Musgrave; Mr. Nunes; Mr. Neugebauer; Mr. Boustany; Mr. Schwarz of Michigan; Mr. Kuhl; Mrs. Foxx; Mr. Conaway and Mr. Fortenberry.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Saxton; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Everett; Mr. Bartlett; Mr. McKeon; Mr. Thornberry; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. Gibbons; Mr. Hayes; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Simmons; Mrs. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia; Mr. Akin; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire; Mr. Turner of Ohio; Mr. Kline; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Franks of Arizona; Mr. Shuster; Mrs. Drake; Mr. Schwarz of Michigan; Miss McMorris; Mr. Conaway and Mr. Davis of Kentucky.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Portman; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. Putnam; Mr. Hulshof; Mr. Bonner; Mr. Garrett; Mr. Barrett of South Carolina; Mr. McCotter; Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida; Mr. Hensarling; Mr. Lungren; Mr. Sessions; Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin; Mr. Bradley; Mr. McHenry; Mr. Mack and Mr. Conaway.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Petri; Mr. McKeon; Mr. Castle; Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Mr. Norwood; Mr. Ehlers; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Platts; Mr. Tiberi; Mr. Keller; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. Porter; Mr. Kline; Mrs. Musgrave; Mr. Inglis of South Carolina; Miss McMorris; Mr. Marchant; Mr. Price of Georgia; Mr. Fortuno; Mr. Jindal; Mr. Boustany; Mrs. Foxx; Mrs. Drake and Mr. Kuhl.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Norwood to rank after Mr. Whitfield and Mr. Shadegg to rank after Mrs. Wilson of New Mexico.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Leach; Mr. Baker; Ms. Pryce; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Castle; Mr. King of New York; Mr. Royce; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mr. Ney; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Paul; Mr. Gillmor; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. LaTourette; Mr. Manzullo; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Shays; Mr. Fossella; Mr. Gary Miller of California; Mr. Tiberi; Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota; Mr. Feeney; Mr. Hensarling; Mr. Garrett of New Jersey; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida; Mr. Barrett of South Carolina; Ms. Harris; Mr. Renzi; Mr. Gerlach; Mr. Neugebauer; Mr. Price of Georgia; Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania; Mr. Davis of Kentucky and Mr. McHenry.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Burton; Mr. Shays; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Mica; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Souder; Mr. LaTourette; Mr. Platts; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Duncan; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Turner of Ohio; Ms. Harris; Mr. Issa; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida;

Mr. Porter; Mr. Marchant; Mr. Westmoreland; Mr. McHenry; Mr. Dent and Ms. Foxx.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Lungren; Mr. Jindal; Mr. Reichert; Mr. McCaul and Mr. Dent.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Mica; Mr. Doolittle; Mr. Reynolds and Mrs. Miller of Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: Mr. Leach; Mr. Smith of New Jersey; Mr. Burton of Indiana; Mr. Gallegly; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Royce; Mr. King of New York; Mr. Chabot; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Tancred; Mr. Paul; Mr. Issa; Mr. Flake; Mrs. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia; Mr. Green of Wisconsin; Mr. Weller; Mr. Pence; Mr. McCotter; Ms. Harris; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. Boozman; Mr. Mack; Mr. Fortenberry; Mr. McCaul and Mr. Poe.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Hyde; Mr. Coble; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Goodlatte; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Lungren; Mr. Jenkins; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Inglis of South Carolina; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Green of Wisconsin; Mr. Keller; Mr. Issa; Mr. Flake; Mr. Pence; Mr. Forbes; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Feeney; Mr. Franks of Arizona and Mr. Gohmert.

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES: Mr. Young of Alaska; Mr. Saxton; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Calvert; Mrs. Cubin; Mr. Radanovich; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania; Mr. Gibbons; Mr. Souder; Mr. Walden of Oregon; Mr. Tancred; Mr. Hayworth; Mr. Flake; Mr. Renzi; Mr. Pearce; Mr. Nunes; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mrs. Drake; Mr. Fortuno; Miss McMorris; Mr. Jindal and Mr. Gohmert.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: Mr. Gingrey.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE: Mr. Hall; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Akin; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Bonner; Mr. Feeney; Mr. Inglis of South Carolina; Mr. Reichert; Mr. Sodrel; Mr. Schwarz of Michigan and Mr. McCaul.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Graves; Mr. Akin; Mrs. Musgrave; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. McCotter; Mr. Poe; Mr. Sodrel; Mr. Fortenberry; Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania; Mr. Westmoreland and Mr. Gohmert.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Petri; Mr. Boehlert; Mr. Coble; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Mica; Mr. Hoekstra; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Bachus; Mr. LaTourette; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Baker; Mr. Ney; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Gary Miller of California; Mr. Hayes; Mr. Simmons; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Mr. Platts; Mr. Graves; Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota; Mr. Shuster; Mr. Boozman; Mr. Pearce; Mr. Gerlach; Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida; Mr. Porter; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Marchant; Mr. Sodrel; Mr. Dent; Mr. Poe; Mr. Reichert; Mr. Mack; Mr. Kuhl; Mr. Fortuno; Mr. Westmoreland and Mr. Boustany.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Everett; Mr. Stearns; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Baker; Mr. Simmons; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Boozman; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida and Mr. Renzi.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC DAY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes as we commemorate Indian National Republic Day. As the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India, and a friend of the Indian American community, I have been privileged to witness and directly participate in the growing Indian-America bond. Our common goal of safeguarding liberty and combating terrorism has united our nations and stimulated an already strong relationship based on values that our cultures share. In the coming years, India and the United States will face many challenges.

As the world comes together and joins forces to help its people, I am positive that the strong ties between India and the United States will serve as an example of fruitful and positive bilateral relations.

And in that spirit I extend my best wishes to the people of India and Indian Americans in a celebration of such a momentous day, Indian National Republic Day.

IN HONOR OF PFC. GEORGE GEER

(Mr. SALAZAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Army Private First Class George Geer, who was killed in the line of duty while serving his country honorably in Iraq.

Each day our men and women willingly face unknown dangers as part of the effort to promote peace and democracy throughout the world. Their individual stories of honor and courage must not be forgotten.

George Geer was from Cortez, Colorado. On January 17, 2005, Pfc. George Geer was killed by a suicide bomber in Iraq. He made the ultimate sacrifice for his country. He was 27 years old.

My heart goes out to George's parents, Harold and Lois, and to his sister, Hope. They too have sacrificed for our Nation. I am humbled by their strength and perseverance in the face of such hardship.

Pfc. George Geer died performing the most noble of deeds, serving and protecting his Nation and fellow countrymen. George and his family have exhibited a rare form of selflessness and courage. I submit this recognition to the U.S. House of Representatives in honor of their sacrifice so that Mr. George Geer may live on in memory.

INTELLIGENCE REFORM IS STILL NOT DONE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the House passed intelligence reform legislation last year, and the bill was another step to strengthen efforts against an enemy bent not on our defeat, but on our destruction. But the conference committee was dominated by those that ignored key recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

The final product was watered down. It did not have a plan to prevent illegal immigrants from obtaining driver's licenses. It did not put in place stricter asylum standards, problems identified by the 9/11 Commission as glaring weaknesses in our Nation's defenses.

Mr. Speaker, 19 of the 9/11 hijackers had 63 driver's licenses between them. How can this Nation in a time of war leave such a glaring hole in our Nation's defenses? Mr. Speaker, this was wrong, and that is why I am hopeful that the legislation introduced this week by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), which I cosponsored which strengthens security standards on driver's licenses and asylum standards, will pass. I hope the Senate and the 9/11 Commission will support our efforts to do so.

GROWING BUDGET CRISIS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in December of 2003, Josh Bolton, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget wrote, "With the adoption of the President's policies, our projections show a solid path toward cutting the deficit in half within the next 5 years."

Fact: this year our deficit will increase for the fourth straight year, to a record \$427 billion. The Webster's dictionary defines a crisis as "an unstable state of affairs." If you are looking for a crisis to solve, look no further. Look at the President's budget deficit.

The President's reckless policies are damaging our Nation's future. Our annual interest payments on the national debt are more than six times what we spent on education last year. They are more than 12 times what we spent on veterans.

What are we doing with this \$7 trillion debt that keeps running up? We are asking our bankers, Japan and China, for more money. They control our future. It is a very fascinating economic strategy.

The President has indicated that his budget will be tough. I agree. With 3 years of record deficit and a record national debt accumulating, it is tough. It is tough on America's future.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the President and the economy, the truth is, we will forever be in his debt.

A STEP TOWARDS LIBERTY IN IRAQ

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, in his second inaugural address just days ago, President George W. Bush restated our Nation's longstanding vision as the beacon of liberty and the arsenal of democracy on planet Earth.

This Sunday, January 30th, because of the leadership of that same Commander in Chief and the courage and sacrifice of our American military and their families, that vision will take one more step forward on Earth with the free elections taking place in the war-torn nation of Iraq.

The Good Book tells us that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. So I know I rise on behalf of millions of Hoosiers when I say to the good people of Iraq, you not only have our sons and daughters and our resources, but you will have our prayers; and our prayers are with all the good people of that nation as they take this small step toward liberty. May it be the beginning of a permanent break with their tyrannical past.

SUPPORT FOR ADVOCATES FOR VETERANS

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), had served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 24 years. He had been the chairman of that committee for 4 years.

On January 5, representatives of 10 national veterans organizations wrote the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) asking him to keep the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) in that position. But he was removed. And a senior GOP aid referred to these veterans by saying, "If they think coming up here to argue for CHRIS SMITH is going to help CHRIS SMITH, they are crazy."

Well, the Republicans in this House may think the advocates for veterans are crazy, but we Democrats do not; and we will not stand by and let this administration or this House of Representatives decimate VA health care.

PUSH POLL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2005

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to increase the disclosure requirements for telephone push polls. My bill, the Push Poll Disclosure Act of 2005, uses the light of

public disclosure to lift the darkness surrounding these smear polls, which are a campaign device to spread disinformation about candidates under the cover of a legitimate poll.

They are not, however, real polls. Their only purpose is to create a negative image among the voting public without leaving a visible trace. My bill combats this obnoxious practice by requiring increased disclosure for polls when more than 1,200 households are included.

The time has come to regulate smear polls for what they are, a campaign tactic, and make those who employ this tactic take full responsibility for their actions.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

EXPRESSING CONCERNS OVER IRAQ ELECTIONS

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am sending a letter to Secretary-Designate Rice and Ambassador Negroponte expressing concerns over the Iraq elections that are to take place in just 5 days.

It will be impossible to determine the extent to which corruption, voter intimidation or outright fraud will mar the results. Here is why: there is a total absence of international election observers for the process. As such, it will make the elections themselves, regrettably, a farce.

International observers were present at polling sites in Nigeria, East Timor, Haiti, Afghanistan, Palestine, and Ukraine. Iraq is the first so-called transitional election in the past 2 decades that will not have international election observers touring polling stations. Instead, Iraq will have a "mission," which will assess the elections from Amman, Jordan, inspecting the Iraq elections from Amman, Jordan.

This is not acceptable, to stage an election that cannot be monitored for fairness, where it cannot be independently determined whether ballot boxes are being stuffed.

EXPRESSING AWE AND ADMIRATION FOR IRAQI PEOPLE

(Mr. CHOCOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the fact that this Sunday, January 30, will be a truly historic day, a day when the Iraqi people, once oppressed and without a voice, will cast their vote in their nation's first democratic elections. It is an amazing fact when you think that just 2 years ago they suffered under a brutal dictatorship.

There is no question that the desperate tactics and deliberate attacks

will increase in the final days leading up to the election. But in spite of the efforts of those that hate freedom, the elections will take place; and it will begin a new period in Iraq's history, a beginning that will lead to freely elected leaders, a national assembly and a constitution founded on freedom and equal rights.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and the people of this great country to join me in awe and admiration for the Iraqi people as they show the world the power of liberty and their determination to forge a path towards lasting freedom.

□ 1015

IN RECOGNITION OF CARL AND FRANCINE DEMMA

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding labor of love and faith in my district.

Carl Demma of Oak Lawn had a vision nearly 20 years ago of expressing his Catholic faith by creating a larger-than-life statue of the Virgin Mary. His goal was to encourage people to reflect on their religious faith at the beginning of the new millennium. Mr. Demma's vision was realized in a 33-foot-tall statue of the Virgin Mary. Our Lady of the New Millennium was blessed by Pope John Paul II in 1998, and, since that time, hundreds of thousands of the faithful have been able to view the statue.

Since Carl passed on in 2000, his beloved wife Francine has dedicated her time and energy to ensuring that the statue continues to be transported from parish to parish for all the faithful to experience.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. and Mrs. Demma for their dedication and their many years of service to the community.

PROTECTING AND PRESERVING SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the year 2018, Social Security will start paying out more money than it is bringing in. In the years 2035 to 2042, somewhere in that range, it will be out of money, and it will force a benefit cut of 27 percent.

Now, that is not a burning crisis today, but it is a slow-burning problem that we in the U.S. Congress need to address. We should do it with a couple of parameters: that we are not going to cut the benefits, we are not going to increase taxes, we are not going to change Social Security for retirees or near retirees. But we should act responsibly in a bipartisan manner to

protect and preserve Social Security and not use it for our advantage in the next election, but come up with long-term solutions for the next generation.

I invite my Democrat colleagues to come in with their ideas. And I would say to Independents and conservatives and liberals alike, let us put these ideas on the table, let us address this situation together in a bipartisan fashion, and let us do it for the sake of my parents, my dad is 87, my mom is 80; and for your parents; and also, again, for the next generation.

PRESERVING SAFETY NET FOR SOCIAL SECURITY, AND CAUTIOUS DELIBERATION NEEDED REGARDING NEXT STEPS IN IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would be quite interested in accepting my good friend's challenge on Social Security, but let me say to my colleagues, the proposed plans of Republicans are an absolute betrayal of the American people and the safety net of Social Security, and I, for one, and those of us who stand under the Democratic umbrella, are not going to stand around while Social Security is being destroyed. Social Security is secure until 2053, and we need to make sure that that safety net remains in place.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to acknowledge the 35 marines that lost their lives this morning in Iraq. I, too, believe in freedom, as most Americans believe in freedom, but I do also believe in truth. As Secretary-to-be Condoleezza Rice will be approved today, I hope that we recognize in this Congress that we have an obligation not to political philosophy, but to the lives of those young men and women on the front lines.

Iraq may be able to be a democracy as we know it in decades and decades to come, but what do we say about the blood of Americans who came to fight a war in Iraq on the basis of weapons of mass destruction? I believe we owe them an apology, and I believe that we owe cautious deliberations on the next steps in Iraq.

MORE FUNDING AND ATTENTION TO SECURE OUR PORTS

(Ms. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has made tremendous strides in securing our homeland since the 9/11 attacks. Americans have performed amazingly well in staying alert and aware, while the Federal Government has done an excellent job in making travel safer for airline passengers.

Nevertheless, our achievements merely highlight how much more work

remains. Before we can truly be safe, we must direct more funding and attention to securing our ports.

America's seaports have become the locomotives of economic growth, receiving 95 percent of our Nation's imports. Florida alone has 14 deepwater seaports, and 56 percent of all of our imported oil comes through the Gulf of Mexico border region. Thus, terrorists know what devastating death and destruction would be wrought through the detonation of one dirty bomb in one cargo container, which would bring international commerce to a screeching halt.

We spend a great deal of time debating how to secure our land border. We must start devoting the same amount of time and energy to the security of our water border, starting today. Through the Gulf of Mexico States Caucus, we will work to ensure that the House accomplishes this goal.

RESIST GIVING IN TO FEAR: TRUST SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a program that is both financially sound and essential to the lives of our seniors. Social Security provides the core retirement benefits for over 30 million retirees, and nearly half of the elderly would live below the poverty line without it.

According to the Board of Trustees, of which four out of six were appointed by President Bush, Social Security is as healthy today as it has ever been. Their 2004 report says that the program can pay all benefits through 2042. After that, even without any changes, they could continue to pay benefits.

The administration is ignoring these facts, deceiving the public, and creating force, hoping to force privatization of Social Security. This deceitful approach that this administration has chosen to wage war on its working Americans is typical of them. They create fear, and then they offer their only solution, one that suits their political goals, not the goals of the people, to whatever crisis they have conjured.

To the people of this country, I say, do not give in to fear. Trust a program with a surplus over a President that created a huge deficit.

TIME TO ABANDON RISKY SOCIAL SECURITY PRIVATIZATION SCHEME

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week we had another reality check on how fiscally devastating Republican fiscal policies are on our Nation. Yesterday the Bush administration announced that the budget deficit is set

to hit another record this year, a whopping \$429 billion.

The President also had to admit that thanks to these new projections, he is already behind in his campaign pledge to cut the deficit in half over the next 5 years. Yet the President has no plans to alter his misguided policies that took us from record surpluses when he arrived in Washington to record deficits now.

But the President is still not finished. He has a plan that would use an additional \$2 trillion in Federal funds to privatize Social Security. Enough is enough. Congressional Republicans need to stop blindly following this President before it is too late, and it is time that they abandon this risky Social Security privatization scheme.

ELECTION AS MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 49), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 49

Resolved, That the following named Members and Delegates be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Holden, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Etheridge, Mr. Baca, Mr. Case, Mr. Cardoza, Mr. Scott of Georgia, Mr. Marshall, Ms. Herseeth, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Melancon, Mr. Costa, Mr. Salazar, Mr. Barrow.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Mr. Murtha, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Mollohan, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Olver, Mr. Pastor, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Hinchey, Ms. Roybal-Al-lard, Mr. Farr, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kilpatrick of Michigan, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Rothman, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Berry.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Spratt, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Evans, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Reyes, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. McIntyre, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Andrews, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Israel, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Meek of Florida, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. McKinney, Mr. Boren.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Moore of Kansas, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Ford, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Baird, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Davis of Alabama, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Allen, Mr. Case, Ms. McKinney, Mr. Cuellar.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Kildee, Mr. Owens, Mr. Payne, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Hinojosa, Mrs. McCarthy, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Kind, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Wu, Mr. Holt, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Bishop of New York, Mr. Barrow.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Waxman, Mr. Markey, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Towns, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Stupak, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wynn, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Strickland, Ms. DeGette, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Allen, Mr. Davis of Florida, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Solis, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Inslee, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Ross.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. Kanjorski, Ms. Waters, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Watt, Mr. Ackerman, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Ms. Carson, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee, Mr. Moore of Kansas, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Ford, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Clay, Mr. Israel, Mrs. McCarthy, Mr. Baca, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Scott of Georgia, Mr. Davis of Alabama, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Cleaver, Ms. Bean, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Ms. Moore of Wisconsin.

(8) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Lantos, Mr. Owens, Mr. Towns, Mr. Kanjorski, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Clay, Ms. Watson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. Ruppertsberger, Mr. Higgins.

(9) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.

(10) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—Mr. Berman, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Payne, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Engel, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Berkley, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Watson, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Cardoza.

(11) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Berman, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Watt, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Waters, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Weiner, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California.

(12) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—Mr. Kildee, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Pallone, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Kind, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Costa, Mr. Melancon, Mr. Boren.

(13) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Mr. McGovern, Mr. Hastings of Florida.

(14) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—Mr. Costello, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Wu, Mr. Honda, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Carnahan, Mr. Lipinski.

(15) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Lipinski.

(16) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mr. Mollohan.

(17) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. Rahall, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Costello, Ms. Norton, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. Filner, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Blumenauer, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Holden, Mr. Baird, Ms. Berkley, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Honda, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Weiner, Ms. Carson, Mr. Bishop of New York, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Carnahan, Ms. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, Mr. Salazar.

(18) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Filner, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Michaud, Ms. Herseeth, Mr. Higgins.

(19) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Mr. Stark, Mr. Levin, Mr. Cardin, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. McNulty, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Pomeroy, Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Emanuel.

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 50

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Mr. Sanders (to rank immediately after Ms. Waters).

(2) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Sanders (to rank immediately after Mr. Kanjorski).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF MEMBERS OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE DURING 109TH CONGRESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(1) of rule X, during the 109th Congress, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence be composed of not more than 19 Members, of whom not more than 11 be from the same party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 54, CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 54) to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 2 of the resolution be stricken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. It provides that the bill shall be considered as read for the purpose of amendment and makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying this resolution. It provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. These amendments shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Com-

mittee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, it provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce this fair, structured rule for H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005. This legislation builds on important reforms that my good friend, the former Governor and now Member of Congress, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has made to the Commemorative Gold Coin program almost a decade ago.

Today, we have the opportunity to bring these same improvements to the Congressional Gold Medal program and ensure that the original intent and prestige of the Congressional Gold Medal program as the Nation's highest civilian award and the most distinguished award given by Congress is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 54 will improve the Congressional Gold Medal program by limiting the number of medals awarded by Congress to no more than two in any calendar year. It would also ensure that the tradition of only awarding these medals to living or recently deceased individuals for their meritorious service continues, as was originally intended by the program.

The proud tradition of this unique honor began when the first Congressional Gold Medal was authorized in 1776 and presented to George Washington in 1790. The tradition of only awarding these medals for military service continued until 1858 when Congress awarded Dr. Frederick Rose, an assistant surgeon in the British Navy, with a medal for the kindness that he showed to sick American naval personnel.

□ 1030

With Dr. Rose's receipt of the gold medal, Congress also created the Medal of Honor as the first permanent military decoration. The creation of the esteemed Medal of Honor allowed Congress to begin using the gold medal exclusively to recognize individuals that have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that will be recognized for generations to come.

Over the years since its inception, without strict rules governing how it was awarded, this venerable program has acquired a small problem. By a slow process, as currently administered, it has grown much larger than it was originally intended. From 1776, when Congress established the award, to 1904, Congress approved only 47 medals. In the last 100 years, Congress has awarded almost twice as many, 86 medals, including 20 in the past decade alone. In the 1990s, Congress faced this same problem of proliferation within the Commemorative Coins Program, which has grown out of control and was costing taxpayers far more than ever envisioned when that program began.

In order to maintain sound fiscal discipline and the prestige of the Congress-

sional Gold Medal Program, we are here today to approve the common-sense reforms by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), our chairman, and supported by the Committee on Financial Services chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY). Many of these reforms simply codify what is already an existing practice in the House Committee on Financial Services and the Senate Banking Committee.

By adopting this legislation, Congress will be able to move more effectively and efficiently to manage the Congressional Gold Medal Program while maintaining the prestige and the purpose for which it was originally created.

I support this rule and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for yielding me the time.

It is a new year, Mr. Speaker, a new Congress and new Presidential term. We have heard new commitments to work across party lines and calls for civility and camaraderie in the halls of the Capitol. We have heard the President speak of a more civilized Washington and a bipartisan approach to the legislative process.

Then and now Congress starts its work. The rhetoric starts; reality sets in. We are not even 2 full weeks into the House legislative calendar, and it is starting to sound like the same old song and dance.

Any way we look at it, Mr. Speaker, process or policy, the House is off to a bad start. It is the first day of normal legislative business in the 109th Congress, and the House is already considering a restrictive rule for a bill that has not gone through proper House procedures.

New Congress Members just coming from parliamentary procedure training session must be doing a double-take. They just spent a week in a refresher course on how a bill becomes a law. Then, all of the sudden, that process has not been followed on one of their first votes. I guess I was confused, too, and what I can say to them is, Welcome to Washington.

The proponents of the underlying legislation will try to argue that it is not a new bill because it was first introduced in the 108th Congress. While that might be true, the Committee on Financial Services did not act on the bill in the 108th Congress, and it has not acted on it in this year.

I ask, why is the full House considering a relatively controversial piece of legislation without any committee action? Why the rush? Why set such a precedent for the 109th Congress' beginning?

The Committee on Financial Services, the committee of jurisdiction for the underlying legislation, will not

even organize itself until next week, let alone hold a hearing or markup on my good friend's, and he is my good friend, the gentleman from Delaware's bill.

Think about it this way: the first bill that the House is considering in the 109th Congress under normal rules actually makes it harder to pass legislation and create laws honoring our country's greatest heroes. Just like Social Security, some of my Republican friends are trying to create a problem where one does not exist.

As the gentleman from Texas already noted, the rule does make in order two amendments offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The first Crowley amendment increases the total number of medals of honor to be permitted awarded from four to six per Congress. The second Crowley amendment provides for an equitable distribution of gold medals between the majority and the minority.

While I intend to support both of these amendments, and certainly appreciate them being made in order, the Committee on Rules failed to make in order a third Crowley amendment which would have maintained the status quo. That amendment would have ensured that worthy groups or individuals and organizations remain eligible to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Committee on Rules also rejected along a party-line vote an amendment to the rule which would have made it open to all germane amendments.

If the underlying legislation were to become law, President and Nancy Reagan never would have received the medal because they received it as a couple. Neither would Dr. Martin Luther King and Coretta Scott King, Joseph DeLaine and Harry and Eliza Briggs, Billy and Ruth Graham, President and Betty Ford, the Navajo Code Talkers or the American Red Cross, just to name a few.

Can anyone in this body honestly suggest that the individuals aforementioned and organizations are unworthy of this institution's top award? Is there an epidemic of distributing too many Congressional Medals of Honor to unworthy recipients that somehow or another has escaped at least me in knowing about them?

Mr. Speaker, I am not worried about Congress going on a spree to award the Medal of Honor to unworthy recipients. The rules applied by the Committee on Financial Services to even consider a bill awarding the Congressional Medal of Honor are so stringent that the integrity and prestige of the award will always be protected.

On the contrary, if today is any indication, perhaps we ought to be just a bit more concerned about the integrity of procedure in the House of Representatives than about the integrity of a system that is dependent upon bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Florida, my good friend from the Committee on Rules, and would like to ask him at this time if he would like to consume the time. At this time, I may have one additional speaker, but do not at this time and would wish that the gentleman would consume his time. Then I would expect to close. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would like to do that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, I appreciate my good friend's good suggestion, and I am prepared to begin yielding time to colleagues who are present to begin speaking.

Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida and ranking member, and the gentleman representing the Committee on Rules on the Republican side and also the author of this legislation.

I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation for some of the very reasons that my good friend and colleague from Florida has enunciated.

I also raise another question, that this body is the people's House and the people represent a wide diversity of America, heroes and sheroes, little unknown to many of us until they rise and shine.

It is interesting that this legislation would come without going to the full committee in this session to be able to have the oversight of the committee structure, and then to be reminded of the fact that we took great joy and pleasure in honoring both President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan, Dr. King and Mrs. King, and of course, legislation that I proposed to acknowledge the Columbia Seven that tragically lost their lives on our behalf as astronauts and heroes in space.

All right. I recognize that judgment is necessary, but this legislation does not speak to judgment. It speaks to denial, and it denies the Congress its authoritative right to make decisions on who has represented America in the most honorable way to deserve a Congressional Gold Medal.

The legislation that I have has over 320-plus sponsors out of 435 and growing. Individual Members acquiesced and affirmed the fact that these individuals were worthy of a Congressional Gold Medal.

I agree, as well, that the Committee on Financial Services has put in place a very effective, very effective oversight of this process.

Let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his in-

sight in his amendments that would expand the numbers for the congressional session and also bifurcate or equalize the numbers for each party.

I, too, believe that there should be restraint in judgment, but I believe as well that America has her heroes and sheroes and who are we in 2005 to predict what might happen in 2010 or 2015 or 2020 where there may be a multitude of heroes who Americans believe are deserving of this worthy award.

I am disappointed and saddened that this could not be a bipartisan process. I, for one, believe that we should overwhelmingly vote against the rule and overwhelmingly vote against this intrusion into the objective and the precise and the bipartisan decisions that have been made on Ronald Reagan and Mrs. Reagan, the President of the United States; Dr. King and Mrs. King, very surely representatives of the human and American spirit.

I would ask my colleagues to reconsider this legislation and most specifically because it violated, if you will, the precise rules that we adhere to, oversight by committees, the Committee on Rules' involvement in an open rule, and the bipartisan spirit in which we honor our heroes and sheroes, whether dead or alive.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the overly restrictive rule that has been reported out of Committee relating to H.R. 54. Despite my disappointment and dismay at not only the criteria of this rule but the nature of the underlying legislation, I am pleased that two amendments offered by my colleague from New York, Mr. CROWLEY were made in order.

The central amendment that would have made this legislation palatable at the very least and not so disrespectful to the heroes that we strive to honor with the congressional gold medal has been effectively blocked by partisan stubbornness. If the import of this legislation is good, why not allow the representatives of this august body to openly debate it before the American people? Are we so ashamed of its true legislative intent that we feel the need to hide behind obstructionist rules? I say that legislation with bona fide purpose should have nothing to fear—at the very least should it fear honest and open debate.

The underlying legislation that is before this House seeks to "provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals" but will essentially limit the bestowal of honor to American icons. One of the main reasons that the medal is bestowed is to make the highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions. HR 54 will summarily restrict this goal and prevent many honored heroes from receiving proper recognition.

Blocking debate on a provision that is utterly unreasonable is disrespectful to the constituents that Members seek to honor with the congressional gold medal.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to announce that we have no further speakers, and I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a bill which the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has brought to the floor, which we believe is a good bill, supported by the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY). I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the Oxley manager's amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 42 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 54.

□ 1043

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 54) to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005, authored by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and urge its immediate passage. The legislation is a commonsense effort to maintain the prestige of this award.

□ 1045

As the Members know, the gold medal is the highest civilian honor bestowed by Congress. It has been award-

ed to a long and distinguished line of individuals who have made significant contributions to this country, beginning with General George Washington even before the Declaration of Independence. Recipients have included civil rights leaders, cultural icons and leaders in science.

But a disturbing trend has emerged since the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) sensibly reformed the commemorative coin program a decade ago. Until that point, Congress approved the awarding of only a few, usually one or two, gold medals each Congress, but approved as many as a dozen commemorative coin programs, often at great cost to taxpayers. Chairman CASTLE's reforms eliminated the cost to the taxpayers, restoring the dignity to the commemorative coin program. He also instituted a requirement that two-thirds of the House should sponsor legislation for either commemorative coins or gold medals before consideration could take place so that support would be broad and bipartisan.

Those reforms have been successful, but denied the opportunity to enact numerous commemorative coin programs. Congress increasingly has turned to the gold medal program, and we now find ourselves in a situation of having fewer honorees for commemorative coins than we do from gold medals. During the last Congress, only three commemorative coins were struck, and we approved five medal programs honoring seven individuals. By comparison, in the first 123 years of the gold medal, only 45 people were so honored.

Mr. Chairman, all medal honorees to date have been good choices and well deserving of the honor. However, we could be faced with a quandary: Either approve a medal for an individual who has had some accomplishment, but probably is not at the same level as a General Washington or a Jonas Salk, or else decline to approve the legislation.

We should not let ourselves get into that situation, Mr. Chairman. Chairman CASTLE's common-sense limit of two gold medals a year, and limiting the recipients to individuals rather than groups, maintains the prestige and honor of receiving a Congressional Gold Medal. Combined with the requirement of a minimum cosponsorship level of two-thirds of the House is the best way to preserve the integrity of the gold medal.

At the appropriate time, I will offer a manager's amendment that seeks to change the effective date of this legislation from December 31 of this year to immediately upon enactment so that the rules for awarding medals would remain the same throughout this Congress and not change midsession.

Mr. Chairman, I urge immediate passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my disappointment that this legislation is not being offered under an open rule. In fact, the chairman of the full Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who holds jurisdiction over this legislation, even requested during his Committee on Rules testimony last night a more open process for debate on this bill, and I thank the chairman for those comments.

I would also like to take a moment to specifically thank and welcome our new Committee on Rules ranking member, my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), who will serve as a true and tireless fighter for Democrats and our rights in the minority on the Committee on Rules over the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are debating today, H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005, while introduced in the previous Congress, was never debated in committee because no hearings were convened, and no markup was held. And given that the Committee on Financial Services has yet to even hold its organizational meeting for the 109th Congress, the committee has obviously not yet had an opportunity to consider this issue carefully. In my view, we are rushing to act on an issue that does not represent a problem.

Having said that, Democrats are open to debating and voting on this legislation. In the last several Congresses, Congressional Gold Medals have been considered in the House under a well-established and a bipartisan process that works well. Regular order for consideration of gold medals involves the need, under the rules of the Committee on Financial Services, to gain the cosponsorship of two-thirds of the House before the legislation is considered in committee, a full two-thirds sponsorship of the House before it is considered in committee.

The bar for consideration for gold medals is set relatively high for a reason: Gaining a two-thirds cosponsorship ensures that a solid bipartisan majority of the House is in full support of honoring a particularly noteworthy individual or individuals.

Under the rule today, I plan to offer two amendments. The first amendment would raise the number of gold medals from two per calendar year to six per Congress, or an overall increase of two medals per Congress. This is especially key, as in the 108th Congress we awarded five Congressional Gold Medals. They went to Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of Great Britain; Dr. Dorothy Height, president of the National Council of Negro Women; Jackie Robinson, the first black player in Major League Baseball; the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, posthumously, and his widow Coretta Scott King, the civil rights icons; and the posthumous awarding to Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine, Harry and Eliza Briggs, and Levi Pearson, the leaders in our Nation's efforts to desegregate public

schools that led directly to the case *Brown et al. v. The Board of Education of Topeka*.

My second amendment would provide for equitable distribution of gold medals between the majority and the minority.

My amendments seek to maintain the spirit and process of bipartisanship that has characterized the House's consideration of gold medals, the highest honor that this Congress can bestow on an individual or group of individuals. It is my hope that the House will adopt these amendments to make this bill a better bill.

Stating that, though, I am dismayed that the Committee on Rules refused to allow consideration of a key amendment that would strike a section of the bill that only permits the granting of Congressional Gold Medals to individuals. While I tend to agree with the notion that distributing what is an exceptional honor to too many individuals could devalue the symbolic worth of a gold medal, there are occasions when more than one person is justified to receive the medal for their honorable actions in tandem with others.

In the last Congress, we enacted into law legislation awarding the Congressional Gold Medal posthumously, as I mentioned before, to Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine, Harry and Eliza Briggs, and Levi Pearson in recognition of their contributions to the Nation as pioneers in the effort to desegregate public schools that led directly to the landmark desegregation case of *Brown v. The Board of Ed.*

In previous Congresses, the House has awarded gold medals to other groups, such as Native American Code Talkers, who were critical to the safety of allied communications during World War II; to the Little Rock Nine, the civil rights pioneers who led to the integration of our public schools; and to Ronald and Nancy Reagan, in honor of their contribution to our country.

I fear that limiting gold medals to only individuals would also limit certain people from consideration who are most deserving of receiving one of our Nation's highest honors.

For example, my good friend and Republican colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) offered an amendment in the previous Congress, which the House passed, to honor the officers, emergency workers, and other employees of the Federal Government and any State or local government, including any interstate governmental entity, who responded to the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and who perished in that attack on September 11 with a Congressional Gold Medal. This would not be possible if this bill passed. And I would hope that my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), will oppose this bill, because if it were to pass, it would put an end to any opportunity to present the Congressional Gold Medal to any of those heroes.

Again, while I urge my colleagues to support my two amendments that were

made in order, I am dismayed that this third amendment was not made in order. If this bill were already law, Congress would not have been able to issue the Congressional Medal of Honor to the Little Rock Nine or to the Reagans. I feel this is a serious oversight in the base of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for his support of the legislation as well as his managing of it here today, and his general goodwill for all people in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005, and I do urge its immediate adoption after consideration of the amendments today.

Congress created the Congress Gold Medal honor in 1776 to recognize military leaders, and awarded the first medal to George Washington for his heroic service in the Revolutionary War, as the chairman indicated earlier. Since then, the gold medal has evolved to become the highest civilian honor Congress confers to express gratitude for distinguished service, to dramatize the virtues of patriotism, and to perpetuate the remembrance of a great event. The legislation we consider today seeks to maintain the prestige of the medal by limiting the number that may be awarded in any given year.

To understand the need for such legislation, a little history of the medal is in order. As I mentioned, the first Congressional Gold Medal was struck in 1776, in Paris, for America had no appropriate facilities at that point, at the behest of the Continental Congress, which had not yet declared independence from Great Britain. The recipient was General George Washington, and the act that inspired the medal was his leadership of the Continental Army in driving the British from Boston.

In the next dozen years, Congress awarded six more gold medals to individuals for heroic action in the Revolutionary War. That is an average of one medal every Congress. By comparison, in the 108th Congress we authorized five medal programs honoring seven individuals and one couple. In the 106th Congress we authorized seven medal programs, but because of multiple recipients, the number of medals totaled more than 300.

Mr. Chairman, all of those medals were deserved, and I supported their authorization. My concern, and a concern shared by many Members, is that the luster and the importance and the meaning of a Congressional Gold Medal will be tarnished if we do not limit the number we award. Reversing this trend will protect the medal's prestige.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple piece of legislation with great meaning. It will ensure the future integrity and

true honor of the award. It is my goal that each recipient, President, civil rights leader, military hero, inventor, or noted healer, who receives the Congressional Gold Medal will remain part of a unique honor bestowed by the United States Congress.

As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, we had a similar problem a decade ago with commemorative coins. While commemorative coins are not as prestigious as Congressional Gold Medals, both are used to recognize moments in history. These coins have also helped raise money through surcharges for a worthy cause. A decade ago, the commemorative coin program had gotten out of control, with many coin programs approved each year, and many of the programs costing taxpayers money. One blatant example is the 1996 Olympics coin program that the GAO estimates cost taxpayers \$26 million.

In response, Mr. Chairman, I authored and Congress approved the Commemorative Reform Coin Act. Now coin programs are limited to two a year and demand full cost recovery for taxpayers before any surcharges are paid. Additionally, before Congress can consider a coin or medal program, two-thirds of the House, 290 Members, must cosponsor the legislation to demonstrate broad bipartisan support. And having done that, I can tell you it takes broad bipartisan support to get the 290 Members.

I believe that the reforms to the commemorative coin program have been extraordinarily successful. Since these reforms were enacted in the 104th Congress, commemorative coins have not cost the taxpayers a dime. Instead, the programs have raised millions for worthy causes, provided valuable collections, and, importantly, restored prestige to commemorative coins.

But something disturbing happened when we reformed the commemorative coin program. The number of Congressional Gold Medals saw a dramatic increase. From 1776, when Congress created the medal, to 1904, Congress approved 47 medals. In the last 100 years, Congress awarded 86 medals, including 20 in the past decade, since the commemorative coin reforms. And this number jumped even higher, over 300, when including multiple recipients for each medal.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, Congressional Gold Medals have gone to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, Jackie Robinson, Mother Teresa, Elie Wiesel, Pope John Paul II, British Prime Ministers Winston Churchill and Tony Blair, Jonas Salk, John Wayne, and Robert F. Kennedy, among others. Reading the list of all the medal recipients and the deeds that earned the medal is quite inspiring. To maintain these medals as the highest of honors, the legislation before us would limit the number of medals that may be awarded to two a year, and clarify that recipients are individuals and not groups.

I understand there is concern by the minority that one bill per year should be designated for each party.

□ 1100

I feel it is important to note that proposals in the past have been sponsored in about equal numbers by Republicans and Democrats, and I do not really recall any discussion of the recipients' or the sponsors' party affiliations. In my view, any such discussion would be inappropriate, as these awards should be awarded in true bipartisan fashion.

In practice, however, not through statute, the Committee on Financial Services requires a two-thirds cosponsorship before considering proposals to award medals, a practice that the Senate has now adopted. I believe by the adoption of these simple changes, we can preserve the prestige and the integrity of the Congressional Gold Medal Program, something I believe all Members support.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in maintaining the integrity of the Congressional Gold Medal by supporting this measure. I urge immediate and unanimous passage of H.R. 54 with no amendments but the manager's amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the angst that I have with H.R. 54 does not speak to the eloquence that we have heard on the floor about our commitment to honoring our heroes and sheroes. Let me make it perfectly clear, despite all of the accolades that we have spoken today, if this legislation were in place, President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan would not receive the Congressional Gold Medal; neither would Dr. King and Mrs. Coretta Scott King; neither would the Indian Code Talkers who helped save thousands of lives in World War II. I think that is the crux of this debate, not whether or not we have restrictions or nonrestrictions because I believe it is a given that the Committee on Financial Services has done a commendable job in its oversight.

As I look back on the numbers in the last four Congresses, how interesting it is and the good sense of the Crowley amendment because those that have been passed by this body only equal to five or six credible, rational and reasonable reasoning for awarding, for example, those who were intimately involved in Brown v. Board of Education that changed the lives of millions of Americans and today even is a standard for equal education in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am confused by the necessity of this legislation and why we would not be able to enthusiastically support the very precise, as I said previously, and thoughtful amendments by the gentleman from New

York (Mr. CROWLEY), particularly those dealing with the idea of the number of gold medals, increasing them to six per Congress. That is 2 years, that means three and three possibly, or however it is broken down, and then the fairness of equal distribution between Republicans and Democrats, all of us, of course, being Americans.

What is to argue the case or why would we argue the case that there were those who contributed together who are not worthy. I do not take this as any kind of personal act by my Republican friends, but I do think it is a misstep in judgment and that we would have benefited from a more bipartisan overview, review of this legislation. For example, we would not have been able to honor, as some Americans perceive as very important, Ruth and Billy Graham.

So this narrow or narrowing or this interpretation of one hero when there may be an adequate partnering that may be important that would symbolize the greatness and goodness of America puzzles me and, in fact, disturbs me. Frankly, the civil rights movement was a group effort and it might be likely that one would want to honor the group of civil rights activists, the unknown, the unsung heroes that we are able to bring to the attention of the United States Congress. How many really knew Harry and Eliza Briggs? How many knew Levi Pearson? But once we debated and found out the facts, we knew that they were in fact heroes and sheroes. I think we do ourselves an enormous disservice by coming down hard-handed on who has given so much for America.

And then I would say why start with divisive legislation. Yes, there are only a few of us on the floor of the House, but we obviously are not able to speak for all of those unsung heroes yet to be brought to the attention of this House. All of us come in our course of life to meet people in our districts and around the country where we claim that we want to bring them to the attention of the American people not frivolously; but after we have looked at the history, we know they are truly worthy of a Congressional Gold Medal.

So why we need this restrictive law that has not already been satisfied by the oversight of a bipartisan Committee on Financial Services and the requirement, Mr. Chairman, the requirement of over 290 signatures, and most of these received close to 400. And that is the test, whether your colleagues will support you.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the gentleman's two amendments, I am querying as to the amendment offered which would really balance this legislation which would speak to protect President Reagan and Dr. and Mrs. Billy Graham and others who came together.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, an amendment was offered yesterday evening before the Committee on Rules that would have asked groups as well as individuals. We struck a portion of the language dealing with limiting this only to individuals. I would have asked, if that amendment had passed, would have enlarged the pool to groups as well. That was not passed in the Committee on Rules, and therefore we are here today working a bill that does not have that provision in it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and simply say that is the spirit of bipartisanship. That would have been reflective of Members having an opportunity in their wisdom to present their case before the United States Congress and the Committee on Financial Services. That would have been fairness to the unsung heroes. That would have been in respect to President and Mrs. Reagan, Dr. King and Mrs. King, Dr. Graham and Mrs. Graham, as well as many others.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this legislation, allow us to work in a bipartisan manner and do not take away from those as yet unrecognized the honor of a Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before the Committee of the Whole because it is unreasonably restrictive. Its passage will result in the preclusion of our ability to pay tribute to Americans in the most respectful manner.

The central amendment that would have made this legislation palatable at the very least and not so disrespectful to the heroes that we strive to honor with the congressional gold medal has been effectively blocked by partisan stubbornness. If the import of this legislation is good, why not allow the representatives of this august body to openly debate it before the American people? Are we so ashamed of its true legislative intent that we feel the need to hide behind obstructionist rules? I say that legislation with bona fide purpose should have nothing to fear—at the very least should it fear honest and open debate.

The underlying legislation that is before this House seeks to "provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals" but will essentially limit the bestowal of honor to American icons. One of the main reasons that the medal is bestowed is to make the highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions. H.R. 54 will summarily restrict this goal and prevent many honored heroes from receiving proper recognition.

Section 2, paragraph (e)(2)(A) of H.R. 54 would limit the striking of a congressional gold medal to "only an individual." Such "unreasonably" restrictive legislation would preclude the bestowal of this award collectively to the 9 students who "voluntarily subjected themselves to racial bigotry during the integration of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, otherwise known as the "Little Rock Nine."

Similarly, under this restrictive provision, the Secretary of the Treasury cannot lawfully strike a congressional gold medal to honor former President Ronald Reagan and his wife

Nancy Reagan in recognition of their services to America or to honor former President Jimmy Carter and his wife Rosalynn Carter. Furthermore, H.R. 54 would make it illegal for Congress to cause the Secretary to strike a congressional gold medal to honor the monumental contributions made to the civil rights movement by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his widow, Coretta Scott King, or the brave employees and others who responded to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and perished and to the people aboard United Airlines Flight 93 who resisted hijackers and caused the plane to crash.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation and ask that my colleagues join me to defeat it unless the overly restrictive provisions are fixed or removed.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In listening to the sponsor in terms of the need for this legislation, one could intimate by the introduction that possibly medals were given out in a haphazard manner. I mentioned before it takes two-thirds of the Members of the House, the entire body, to introduce a gold medal for its consideration in the Committee on Financial Services, a bar that I believe is a very, very high bar and one that is not easily attained.

I would also point out that limiting this to individuals, and again to reiterate, Martin Luther King and Coretta Scott King were both issued the gold medal. They would not have gotten that medal under this legislation. Harry and Eliza Briggs, Levi Pearson, and Reverend Joseph Armstrong DeLaine were all issued the medal in one provision. As mentioned before, Nancy Reagan, along with President Reagan, would not have been eligible. Under the provisions today, they would have to get it individually. Betty and Gerald Ford, the Little Rock Nine, and Dr. Graham and Ruth Graham would not have received it either. I think therein lies a tremendous flaw.

It also intimates that there may be too many of these gold medals given out. Who that received this medal in the past was not worthy of it? Was it Dr. Martin Luther King and Coretta Scott King; was it Reverend DeLaine, Harry and Eliza Briggs, and Levi Pearson; was it Jackie Robinson; was it Dorothy Height; Tony Blair in the last Congress?

In the 106th Congress was it Nancy Reagan; was it Pope John Paul, II; was it Charles Schulz, the great cartoonist? Was it Rosa Parks? Who amongst those was not qualified, who do we believe was not deserving of this medal. Therein lies the flaw in this bill. It actually limits us from giving to those who I believe are most deserving of recognition of this gold medal.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by first indicating to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) as well as myself acknowledge that the

folks who received the medal in the past were most deserving.

I would point out, in fact, that the medal that was awarded, for example, to Ronald and Nancy Reagan, was one medal, and the same thing with Dr. King and Coretta Scott King, and Betty and Gerald Ford. Couples are treated much differently from a group. I guess perhaps what I found in studying this, perhaps the most egregious example of going beyond what the initial scope of the medal was was in the 106th Congress where we awarded five medal bills, one of them was for the Navajo Code Talkers which did not go in regular order. It was attached at the last minute to an appropriations bill. It not only covered the 29 original code talkers but also an additional 275 of those who qualified as code talkers.

I guess, and I do not want to speak for the sponsor of the legislation, but I think it points out the need to tighten these requirements. That is what the purpose of this legislation is all about.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, would it be safe to say under regular order if this legislation were passed that the code talkers, under regular order, and that was an extraordinary provision made in the appropriations process, under regular order would they be eligible to receive this medal in the future if this bill were to pass?

Mr. OXLEY. If the bill were passed, the answer is no, they would not.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is the point I am trying to make. To say that the code talkers, and I am not saying the gentleman is suggesting this, but to suggest that they did not deserve the ultimate award, even as a group, for what they provided to the service of this country during World War II is just ridiculous. They certainly deserved as a group. Any one individual, no. There were multiple individuals who provided an incredible service to us.

I would also point out that two is not individual. Two individuals makes up a group, to my understanding, and that would include Nancy and Ronald Reagan. That would include any husband and wife, including Dr. King and Coretta Scott King. That would preclude them from getting this medal in the future. That is my understanding of the legislation before us.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me point out in the case of the Navajo Code Talkers, there were other tribes also that had code talkers, not just the Navajo. Again, the issue is where do we start and where do we finish in this area.

Again, going back to the history of the medal, and the first recipient was George Washington, it was to an individual and was to an individual for a very, very long period of time.

The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) pointed out correctly, histori-

cally the gold medal was given out quite rarely, 45 in 123 years, to individuals. The change ironically was brought about with the change in the Commemorative Coin Program that did in fact move the Congress to adopting more gold medals.

This is an effort to try to get back to where history started us, awarding that medal to an individual and awarding it not to a group, no matter how small or how large, and that really was the intent of the legislation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1115

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize the significance of this medal, that it is not given out willy-nilly; that, as I mentioned before, it takes extraordinary measures to get enough support to get this medal passed. I recognize that the first person who received this medal was General George Washington, prior to him becoming President of the United States, when the country was brand new, when we did not have the richness of diversity and of events that have taken place throughout the history of our country ever since this first medal was given to George Washington; that we have grown as a Nation, in size and in stature; and that there have been many events that have occurred throughout our history since the striking of the first medal that have inured greatly to the advancement of our country that from time to time need to be recognized. That is what this medal gives an opportunity to do, both to individuals and to groups.

Certainly General Washington was an incredible individual, someone who was deserving of the first medal that was ever produced, and I think he accepted that on behalf of all those men and women who fought for independence from Great Britain back during the War of Independence. But certainly we have grown in size, both in States, from Thirteen Colonies and States to 50 States, and the number of people in this country have grown incredibly since the founding of this Nation, and the events that have occurred throughout our history has certainly changed the shape of the distribution of this medal as well. I think that needs to be recognized and taken into consideration.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to my friend from Delaware, the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, not to prolong the discussion, because I think the gentleman from New York is making some very valid points that should be debated, one of them which is an amendment which is not included here today, and

that is the issue of the groups. We have checked the history of this. To the best of my knowledge, and the gentleman may have some different evidence, I do not think it is different because it is fairly clear who has received these medals, it has always been individuals historically. It was never couples. That is only something that has happened in the more recent couple of decades, perhaps a couple of times. As far as the groups are concerned, there have only been three altogether.

Certainly I am not suggesting any of them are not deserving, for goodness sake. They all are. The Navajo Code Talkers clearly are deserving. That obviously created some problems because of the volume of the medals, and it was done in sort of an unusual procedure. The Red Cross is another very deserving, and so are the veterans of the Civil War, which is the other group we found, although that was done much after the Civil War. There are all kinds of groups out there.

The Congressional Gold Medal of Honor has always been bestowed upon an individual in a very special ceremony to honor that individual. It is not easy to get done. I do not know if the gentleman has done it. As I said before, I did it. It is difficult to get 290 signatures on anything around here. So it is difficult to get done. So obviously it is going to be somebody who is deserving. It is going to be as bipartisan as could be. You cannot do it with one party or the other. You have got to get everybody. That is what the history of it is.

We tried to develop this legislation to have a great recognition of what we consider to be the greatest honor this Congress can give to a limited number of individuals, which was always what the intent of it was. There are a whole lot of ways of recognizing groups. You and I could sit here and name groups for hours at a time that could be honored. But the Congressional Gold Medal was never really created for that purpose. That is the intent of what we are trying to do in the legislation. I just wanted to make that point in the history of it.

Mr. CROWLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, let me just make a point. I appreciate what the gentleman from Delaware has said. The reality is, though, a country of 300 million people, only 20 medals have been awarded in the past decade. That is not an awful lot of medals. The point that the gentleman is making is that it has been extraordinary when we have actually issued this medal to groups. Why are we now limiting ourselves; when it is extraordinary, recognized as extraordinary, why are we now officially and legally limiting the ability of Congress to issue this medal to groups? I do not understand that.

We understand the process is hard. The gentleman has just said himself to get two-thirds of the Members of this House truly requires bipartisanship to get this done. This is not done, as I

mentioned before, in a willy-nilly manner. There is great effort involved. I understand it.

I remember when my friend from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) was doing this for John Cardinal O'Connor and the effort that it took to get both sides to get enough Members to sign onto that. I do understand the difficulties in that, but I hope the gentleman understands the appreciation that has been set forth by my testimony here today as well as my good friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) that sometimes, not oftentimes, it is not just individuals, but it is groups who are responsible for incredible, incredible events in this country and I believe are deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal. I hope that the gentleman would agree with that and we will have a motion to recommit that will, if passed, put this back to committee and will strike that language limiting it only to individuals.

Mr. OXLEY. Reclaiming my time, and the gentleman may want to respond. Let me just comment. There is an avenue, I would suggest to my friend from New York, to honor large groups. That would be the commemorative coin. It is somewhat ironic that after the reforms that were made by the gentleman from Delaware where we tightened the restrictions on commemorative coins, and for good reason, that we then had this increase in the gold medal. I think we can safely say that the gold medal traditionally supports the concept of honoring an individual for service to the country, and that the commemorative coin, which has been essentially put on the back burner, presents a very appropriate avenue for recognizing groups that heretofore have not been honored.

I think that the reforms in the past and the ones that the gentleman from Delaware is now propounding in this bill makes excellent sense. I think once the Members understand the changes, that they are going to gravitate toward the concept of a commemorative coin as opposed to the gold medal. That is precisely what the gentleman from Delaware proposes in this legislation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Not to prolong the debate, either, because I know we want to move on, but since 1999 when we passed the Coin Act, there have been some concerns on our side of the aisle. I know that one of the amendments your side has accepted, or that was accepted in the Rules Committee, it remains to be seen whether it passes or not, that would evenly divide the number of gold medals, that did not exist in the coin bill that passed. Overwhelmingly it has been one side. In terms of bipartisanship, it has not been very bipartisan in terms of coins that have been established. According to our records, 15 out of the 16 coin bills that were passed were sponsored by Republicans. I do not think that is just going to happen under this legislation. That is also, I think, some of the fear in terms of changing the rules, for lack of a better word, on the gold medal has

stirred up consternation on our side of the aisle. I offer that as well.

I recognize that the minting of a coin is a way that we can bring recognition to individuals and to groups. I just do not think that we should be limiting ourselves as the House of Representatives and as a Congress in reducing our leverage or our ability to honor groups of individuals who have done incredible, incredible works on behalf of this Nation. I think that is what that provision of the bill will actually end up doing is limiting, tying our hands from honoring groups in the form of the Congressional Gold Medal. That is why I stand in opposition to that.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not mean to reiterate or repeat too much. Looking at the history of these Congressional Gold Medals, though, I think is very telling in terms of what we are doing because the history has always been to individuals for outstanding achievement. So in terms of the groups, I really think we should honor that. That is not disrespectful of any group that has gotten it or all the other groups who are potentially eligible out there if you use them in that criteria of measurement.

But the other issue is interesting, and that is how many of these should we be able to have? First of all, the history of the gold medal has been very bipartisan. I think, as we all know, when we are dealing with that many signatures, it is going to be bipartisan. There is no question about that. But my sense is that the two a year is not as limiting as one might think when you really again look at the history of this. In fact, if anything, it would be an expansion over what the total history of it has been. By the time you go through a legislative session and you gather 290 signatures and you go through committee and you go to the floor, and I have handled these bills, they often happen the last day, by the way, so it is always very confusing in terms of what we are doing. I think you are going to find this is not as limiting as one might think.

Again, I recognize the fact that it is a bigger country, that there is much more going on in the country and that kind of thing, but we are really trying to make sure that this is truly an honor for somebody who does something extraordinary in science or the arts, or an elected official or somebody of that nature, usually a President. I think the only elected official who has ever been honored; people in religion, people who have just absolutely stood out in their circumstances.

My sense is while we can argue here on the floor that it is limiting, I think the bottom line is it is not going to end up being as limiting as one might think. Hopefully it would not be. Obviously if that happened to be the case, it is something that could always be revisited, but I just do not think it is going to be the case.

I believe that straightening this out is actually going to make these gold

medals much more of a distinction than perhaps they would be if we allowed this to continue, particularly with the commemorative coin changes, increasing the pressure to try to do so many of these.

Mr. OXLEY. Let me, in closing, Mr. Chairman, indicate, first of all, my respect for the Members who have undertaken the responsibility of going out and getting 290 signatures. Virtually everyone I have talked to said, never again, because of the difficulty. I said, well, think of it this way. You get a chance to meet a lot of new friends. Every time you walk over or ride over for a vote, every time you see a Member in the dining room, wherever it may be, you are getting their support. But it is a difficult process.

I think the gentleman from Delaware was right in raising that bar to where it is now, because it really does focus one's attention on how difficult that process is. It does make it, by definition, a bipartisan process. That is a fact of life that we deal with time and time again. The legislation before us, I think, does restore the medal to what it was envisioned to be way back in 1776.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 54 is as follows:

H.R. 54

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. REASONABLE STANDARDS ESTABLISHED FOR CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS.

Section 5111 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL STANDARDS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—During any calendar year beginning after December 31, 2005, the Secretary of the Treasury may strike not more than 2 congressional gold medals for presentation pursuant to an Act of the Congress.

"(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may strike congressional gold medals only in accordance with the following requirements:

"(A) RECIPIENTS.—Only an individual may be a recipient of a congressional gold medal.

"(B) TIMING.—No gold medal may be presented posthumously on behalf of any individual except during the 20-year period beginning 5 years after the death of the individual (unless the Act of Congress authorizing the striking of such medal was enacted before the death of such individual)".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 109-1.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report,

equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in House 109-1.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OXLEY

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. OXLEY:

Page 2, beginning on line 2, strike "During any calendar year beginning after December 31, 2005," and insert "Beginning on the date of the enactment of the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005,".

Page 2, line 6, insert "in any calendar year" before the period at the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, the amendment changes the effective date of the introduced version of the bill from after December 31, 2005 to instead make the new limitation on the number of congressional gold medals effective on enactment of the bill. The change will be made so that uniform guidelines governing the medal program will be in effect for the whole 109th Congress and beyond and not change in the middle of the Congress. If we were to pass the bill but leave the effective date until the end of the session there would be a land rush to enact bills on gold medals that would place Members in an awkward position.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member claim time in opposition?

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Something that is not often highlighted outside the hall is that there are actually friendships between Democrats and Republicans, and Mr. OXLEY and I share that. I would like to point out for the record though that he is extremely partisan when it comes to congressional baseball, and I hope that next year he gives the Democrats an opportunity to have a win.

Having said that, I have no objections to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-1.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CROWLEY:
Page 2, strike line 2 and all that follows through line 6 and insert the following new paragraph:

"(1) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—During the 2-year period comprising each Congress (beginning with the 109th Congress), the Secretary of the Treasury may strike not more than 6 congressional gold medals for presentation pursuant to an Act of the Congress.".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume. This amendment is a simple and fair amendment that would increase the maximum number of Congressional gold medals that Congress could award from two per calendar year to six per Congress, an increase of two medals per Congress. The reason for this amendment was best summed up by the Republican Rules Committee Member, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) last night during his questioning of Chairman OXLEY. He had concerns that the bill in its current form would make members hesitate before introducing their own Congressional gold medal bills until late in the first year, waiting to see if others had more noteworthy recipients, then late in the first year rushing to introduce their bills and possibly missing the two medals in 1 year deadline due to the high threshold of needing two-thirds of the House as cosponsors, then forcing a larger number of congressional gold medal bills to compete for the two open slots in the following year.

I too share some of those concerns and believe we can address this by passing this amendment. This would allow for the passage of six medals over the life of a Congress instead of two per year over the life of a calendar year.

I believe that Members on both sides would prefer the flexibility of having more rather than fewer possibilities to award gold medals to citizens who deserve to be bestowed with one of our Nation's highest honors. But this higher number does not cheapen the medal because of the high threshold needed for consideration, two-thirds of the chamber. Foolish medal bills will not attract the support that they would need for consideration.

Finally, this amendment is needed in the most practical purpose yet. In the last Congress we awarded five congressional gold medals. They went to Tony Blair, Prime Minister of Great Britain, Dr. Dorothy Height, President of the National Council of Negro Women, Jackie Robinson, the first Black player in Major League Baseball, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., posthumously and his wife Coretta Scott

King, the civil rights icons, and posthumously awarded to the Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine, Harry and Eliza Briggs, and Levi Pearson, the leaders in our nation's efforts to desegregate public schools that led directly to the case of Brown versus the Board of Ed.

Additionally, we granted six medals in the 106th Congress and six in the 105th Congress. In the 106th Congress we passed into law three Democratic sponsored bills and three Republican sponsored bills. They went to Ronald and Nancy Reagan, Pope John Paul II, Charles Schulz, John Cardinal O'Connor, Theodore Hesburgh, Rosa Parks.

And in the 105th Congress two Democratic sponsored bills and four Republican sponsored bills for medals became law. Gerald and Betty Ford, the Little Rock 9, Nelson Mandela, to the patriarch Bartholomew, to Mother Teresa of Calcutta and to Frank Sinatra, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

□ 1130

This amendment is about flexibility for Members, the ability to debate and consider legislation over the entire Congress just as we do with every other piece of legislation. It will not cheapen but rather enhance this most prestigious of American honors. In fact, the existing Committee on Financial Services rule requiring two-thirds cosponsorship of the House for a gold medal, which by definition represents broad-based bipartisan support, prevents the awarding of frivolous and undeserved medals to groups of individuals. I trust that two-thirds of the House represents a solid bipartisan consensus of the will of the House and therefore believe that this acts as a check on any effort to award medals to any groups of individuals who in the opinion of the House do not deserve such award. I urge the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is really in many ways contrary to the reforms that are already enacted, led by the gentleman from Delaware and the one that is now before us. The institution of two-thirds of the Members was very important, and the reforms in the Commemorative Coin Reform Act, which was adopted almost 10 years ago, instituted a two-coin-per-year maximum. The reforms in that program have worked perfectly. Congress has not passed more than two programs for issue in any year since the law passed in 1996. One year, in 2003, only one coin was issued. The reforms have restored the dignity of the commemorative coin program, which had spun out of control; and similar reforms will do the same for a Congressional Gold Medal. So it seems to me a natural progression in the reform process. And, indeed, the Founding Fathers found the need to award only 45 medals in the first 123

years of our country, but over the last decade Congresses have awarded nearly 10 times that many in just 10 years. I think those numbers are critical in understanding why the necessity for this reform effort, and for that I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am disappointed that the chairman will not support this amendment. I think it is a reasonable amendment, one that I do not think in any way disrupts what the intention of the bill by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the sponsor, is, that is, to limit the number. We certainly are limiting the number in this amendment to six as opposed to what the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) would do per calendar year, which would be four. We are still limiting it to six. I think in the most recent history, we have not done more than six within a Congress. This again will help to free the hands of Members to introduce gold medal legislation for people who they believe are worthy of that great honor.

I would just like to point out again that the Founding Fathers in their wisdom did not have as many people that they had to honor during that time. We have grown more than tenfold since the founding of this Nation. There have been many more events that have taken place since the Founding Fathers initially granted those initial gold medals, and I think that once again if we do not pass this, we will further be limiting our ability to ensure that those who are most deserving will receive this great honor.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. First of all, this is not a killer amendment. This is not an unreasonable amendment, and the sponsor has certainly always been a very reasonable Member of Congress, and we are arguing at the margins here in terms of what we are doing, and I recognize that. And I recognize these arguments because they are compelling to a degree.

Having said all those things, I still oppose it. And let me explain why. It is not a lot different from what I have already said, Mr. Chairman, and that is essentially we are trying to make this a medal of true distinction for true heroes of the United States of America. I also believe, by the way, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) said something I thought was interesting, and that is it is difficult to get the names on the legislation. So the first year becomes a little more difficult, and that is true. We sort of learn techniques in this when we have done it.

One is we take it to conferences or big gatherings of people and pass it out that way. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) will always be a hero in my mind because he took it amongst the Democrats and got a lot of signatures when I was struggling with it on a bill that I did last year, and I appreciate that a great deal. But I have learned when one really applies oneself, they can do it reasonably rapidly; and hopefully the committees will be able to be responsive to it and will be able to do two a year if that is what we decide to do. But my judgment is four in total in the course of 2 years is sufficient.

And I am worried about the influx that is going on. The chairman cited the numbers. I do not remember the exact numbers. It was something like 45 medals in the first 120 years and now 10 times that many in the last 10 years. That means that this has increased, I think, at a rate that is too rapid, and again I do not in any way belittle anyone who has received this because they are all very distinguished people. But having said that, we want this to be the highest honor possible. So my judgment is we should defeat the amendment. If at some point it proves we need to expand this, we would certainly consider that. But I think we should try to restore this program to where it was before.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsor made compelling arguments that the amendment is reasonable. Therefore, one would conclude that if it is reasonable and compelling arguments are made that there would be bipartisan support for the amendment. Unfortunately, that is not going to be the case. I hope that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, though, do recognize that not only are there compelling arguments, that they are reasonable and that it is a reasonable amendment and therefore deserves to be voted in favor of. And I hope that my colleagues on the other side as well as my side of the aisle view it the same way.

Mr. Chairman I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 in House Report 109-1.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CROWLEY: Page 2, line 6, insert "and the Secretary may not strike any congressional gold medal, notwithstanding an Act of the Congress providing for the striking and presentation of such congressional gold medal during a period referred to in this paragraph, if at least half the total number of congressional gold medals permitted to be struck under this paragraph during such period were already authorized to be struck during such period pursuant to Acts of the Congress that were originally introduced as bills or joint resolutions by Members associated with the same political party as the political party with which the Member is associated who introduced the bill or resolution that resulted in the Act of the Congress that authorized the striking of such congressional gold medal" before the period at the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope that this amendment would also be received as reasonable and with cogent arguments. My second amendment made in order under the rule would allow for the equitable distribution of these medals between the majority and the minority. Since the 104th Congress, 24 gold medal resolutions became law. Using the process currently in place that has worked so well for us, the two parties in the House have evenly split sponsorship of these medals. Republican Members have sponsored 10 medals and Democratic Members have also sponsored 10 medals. In fact, this amendment probably makes more sense with Republican support in it than Democrats, as in the 108th Congress, five congressional medals were awarded and four of those were sponsored by Democrats, only one by a Republican.

But I offer this amendment out of basic fairness for both sides. I, therefore, believe if we are to limit the number of gold medals and if we are to obtain the bipartisanship that has characterized the process, my amendment should be passed by the Chamber, my fear being that if we limit it to only four, then leadership will decide who will sponsor those four, and we in the minority may find ourselves on the short end of that stick. And that is why I offer this amendment. I hope that the Members will agree to accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do oppose the amendment. I have some empathy for the first amendment

offered by the gentleman from New York, but certainly not this one. Clearly, if there is a bipartisan element to this whole idea of getting two-thirds of the people supporting it, it is the Congressional Gold Medal, and I think the gentleman somewhat undercuts his own argument by giving us the figures that he did because, in fact, I do not think most Members, when they are approached by a Member carrying that bill, really are concerned about whether it is a Republican sponsor or a Democrat sponsor. They are concerned about who that individual being honored is. And just by the definition of having two-thirds sponsor would indicate a strong bipartisan support and historically that has always been the case.

And I think that the amendment would tend to compartmentalize the authors of these gold medal resolutions that would be difficult to enforce and perhaps would cause some kind of a rush to try to get the necessary signatures prematurely. So I think it is really difficult for the committee, for example. As the gentleman knows, who has served on my committee with great distinction, we pride ourselves on the bipartisanship of the committee and the leadership of the committee, and we have continued to do so. So I think this is superfluous at best and, as a result, would oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague, the chairman of the committee. Just to add that, yes, we do work in a very bipartisan way. If the chairman and I were making decisions as to who would receive the gold medal, I think we would work it out amongst ourselves to make sure that it was done in a very bipartisan way. That, unfortunately, has not been the history of the House, and I just point out, for instance, as I mentioned earlier, back when we created the commemorative coin legislation in 1999, out of the 16 coins that have been created, 15 have been introduced by Republican Members, only one by the minority. The majority has had 15 of the 16. The minority has had one. I do not think that is a very fair and balanced way in which we can collectively and bipartisanship recognize those who have made tremendous sacrifices or achievements or contributed to this country.

And I believe that we are limiting it to, in this case, this legislation, if passed the way it does, four congressional gold medals that we in the minority may very well find ourselves in a very difficult position in that we may not have any of our honorees awarded the medal even though we go through the process of collecting the two-thirds. It then becomes a political decision as to which honorees will get the gold medal in that particular year and which will not. For instance, if there

are 16 individuals who are sponsored by Members of the House and those individuals get two-thirds of the signatures required, which of the 16 will get the four medals? Which of those 16? That decision will be made based on a political decision that is made within the House, and I dare say that outside influence would also come to bear on that decision that was made as well.

□ 1145

That is why I am asking for this fair and balanced approach; that if we are going to limit it to just four, that it will be two per year. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask that it is done in this way.

Quite frankly, if there is someone that the Democratic side of the aisle, if we have used up our one per year and we have another extraordinary person, I think we can work with each other to ask a Republican Member of the House to sponsor that bill. And vice versa. If we somehow find we have run out of opportunities on our side to introduce legislation, I do not think it is unusual to ask a Member of the other side of the aisle to sponsor the bill.

That is the spirit in which I think we can work in a bipartisan way to ensure that every person who receives this gold medal, besides getting a two-thirds vote, it is done in a bipartisan way. I do not think this is frivolous, and I do not think this trivial.

That is why I offered the amendment, and I hope we pass it.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I made a couple of these points before, and again I will not repeat too much here, but first and foremost is the 290 signatures. I do not know if one party is ever going to have 290 Members or not, I sort of doubt it, at least in the time most of us are around here, and you need both parties in order to do this.

I learned with the coin that I did, which was Benjamin Franklin. I cannot tell you, and hardly anyone can tell you, whether Benjamin Franklin was or would have been a Republican or a Democrat in his history. We do not know the politics of people like George Washington, and certainly the people who have been from other countries, a number of individuals who received medals here in the Congress of the United States.

In the history of the gold medals, as I believe the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) pointed out, it has been as much Democrats, even more so than Republicans. Even on the business of the commemorative coins, a number of the sponsors in the Senate have been Democrats as well.

I just have never noticed a lot of politics in this, I guess is my point. It seems to me I have been asked to sign these, and I generally sign them, unless it is something I think is spurious, by Democrats and Republicans. I do not

think about it. Certainly, if a party feels it is being slighted, they can say we are just not going to sign on to something.

I do not think this needs a political balance. What it really needs, I think, is to find out, if we are going to do two, who the two most distinguished individuals are who should be recognized and go ahead and recognize them, apart from whatever the politics may be. I do not think it is going to fall down along political lines.

So I do rise in opposition to this. I just think it is sort of a necessary strain on having a political balance on something which is not essential.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I know that the gentleman does not approach this in any other fashion but a bipartisan fashion.

But the question I have is if we are going to limit this to two per year, it could be that five Members on our side of the aisle have five individuals they want to recognize. There could be five individuals on the Republican side of the aisle who have five individuals they want to recognize. That is 10 people, 10 bills, 10 instances where Members have garnered two-thirds.

Who then will decide who gets the medals? It then becomes a very political decision as to who gets each of the medals. Will it be the five on the majority side? Will it be two from the majority side? Will it be two from the minority side? Will it be one each? Who of the 10 deserving will get it, and who will not get it?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I will be glad to yield further in a moment, it typically has not worked that way. Typically, the way you do it is, somebody comes to you with the idea, maybe it is a Thomas Edison or somebody of that ilk, of that nature, and you generally will then go to your leadership or to the leadership on the other side or to the chairman of the committee and say, Look, I am interested in getting this done. If I am going to go out and get the 290 signatures, I want some idea that it is going to be considered.

I would be dumbfounded if you had five on one side and five on the other. In fact, I would be dumbfounded if you had two on one side and two on the other. You generally sort of pre-clear it; and, generally speaking, politics has just not entered into it. Before you go through all that effort and work, you want to get a pretty good idea that the bill is going to be able to get at least through the House. Then, by the way, getting it through the Senate is another whole other issue that you have to deal with as well.

So, typically, we have not had a surplus of these. Generally speaking, when we have gotten to the 290, it has already been pretty well agreed upon by leadership.

As the gentleman knows, on commemorative coins, they can be done in out years. We are doing coins already for 2007 and years beyond that, I believe, at this point. But almost always you work it out in advance.

As the gentleman knows from our committee work, I do not know of any time where we have actually had to pick and choose at the committee on these coins. It is almost always worked out in advance and agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, I truly do not worry about this from a political point of view. I really do not think this is a necessary amendment to deal with that, based on what I have seen. I do not think limiting it to two is going to change that at all.

I certainly would support the best people, which is what we are trying to do. Frankly, most of these bills, while there may be a Democrat sponsor or a Republican sponsor, almost always has a cosponsor from the other side. You cannot really do it without sponsors from both sides. So there is much more bipartisanship in this process than almost anything I know about in this Congress.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the rules will have changed once we pass this bill, whereas right now it is unlimited. Granted, where it is unlimited, there has not been this rush to introduce bills. As the gentleman mentioned before, this is not done in a very quick fashion. This is done in a bipartisan way.

But when we limit it to two per year, we are putting a cap on it, I think we can in the future find ourselves in a situation where, all right maybe five on each side is a little much, maybe two on each side. Then which of the four? Who makes that decision as to which of the four gets the medal? And therein lies the politics.

Unfortunately, I think you are creating more politics in this bill. I do not think that is your intent. I think you are doing this because you want to enrich the value of the gold medal. I understand that. But I think inherently by the changes being proposed, you are bringing more politics into the decisionmaking as to who obtains this medal. That is what I am trying to in a sense, avoid by evenly dividing between Democrat and Republican, majority, minority, the ability for both sides to equally participate in this process.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, technically, as the gentleman and I both know, we have seen a lot, the majority is always going to control ultimately what is going to happen on the floor. It will go through the committee and go to the floor.

I still go back to a whole history. I have been here for 12 years. I have watched these medals. I have never seen a bit of politics in these medals. I just have not seen it.

I do not think the limiting of the numbers is really going to alter that. I

think a large part now is because you need all those signatures, you just cannot do it in a partisan sense.

So I do not think this amendment is necessary. I think it brings in an element of politics that frankly we just do not have in the legislation. So I will oppose it. I understand the gentleman's arguments, but I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, I think that in the past there may have been some politics involved. I understand that one of my colleagues on this side had achieved the requisite number of signatures for a commemorative gold medal for the Columbia 107 in the last Congress, in the middle of the last Congress, and that was never awarded.

So I do not know why. I do not know if there was any reason for that, when the requisite number of signatures were given, that that bill was not taken up in the committee and that Member was not successful in getting that award to the Columbia 107. Why that was not done, I do not know. I do not know if politics was part of that. Maybe someone can answer that question.

But therein lies the problem, that from time to time, quite possibly there is politics involved as to why some individuals receive the gold medals and others do not.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, to close, and again in opposition, I think it is unfortunate and really not necessary to put Republican-Democrat in the statute. That is really what we are trying to do; that is what the gentleman from New York is trying to do. This is an issue that needs to be worked out at the leadership level, which traditionally has been the case.

The last example that the gentleman mentioned, I do not know what all that had to do with, but I think it was above our pay grade. But at the same time, that is how it works, and to encase Republican and Democrat in the statute I think at this time would certainly not be in the best interests of the process, and that is why I continue to oppose my friend's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague on the other side. It is the pay grade issue I am concerned about, as the gentleman mentioned, as to who makes these decisions and as to why some individuals are successful in garnering a gold medal for an individual or group, and maybe another is not. There is some political judgment that is made as well, I believe.

As the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) said, there is a process that

will begin after this legislation is passed, nuances that Members will work through. I would just offer, if this amendment were to pass, they would work through these nuances.

As I mentioned before, if two gold medals were enacted into law by Democrats and I had a third that I wanted to get passed, I would go to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and say, Mike, we do not have any more room on our side. Here is an opportunity; someone is deserving. Would you consider sponsoring this and passing it? I think, quite frankly, if there was a compelling argument, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) would say, Certainly, JOE CROWLEY. We will do it.

That is a nuance to work through as well in terms of working in a bipartisan way. This simply ensures that both Republicans and Democrats are working in a bipartisan way, beyond the two-thirds vote; that medals are not being used for political purposes, but are being given because the individuals deserve them. That is what we are trying to do with this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CROWLEY of New York and Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CROWLEY of New York. The first vote will be on Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CROWLEY of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 212, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—189

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Ackerman	Harman	Owens
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Andrews	Herseth	Pascarell
Baca	Higgins	Pastor
Baldwin	Hinchey	Payne
Barrow	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bean	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Honda	Pomeroy
Berman	Hooley	Price (NC)
Berry	Hoyer	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Inslee	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Ross
Boren	(TX)	Rothman
Boswell	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Kildee	T.
Capps	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanders
Capuano	Kind	Schakowsky
Cardin	Kucinich	Schiff
Cardoza	Langevin	Schwartz (PA)
Carmahan	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Carson	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Case	Lee	Serrano
Chandler	Levin	Sherman
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cleaver	Lipinski	Slaughter
Clyburn	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Lowey	Snyder
Cooper	Lynch	Solis
Costello	Maloney	Spratt
Cramer	Markey	Stark
Crowley	Matheson	Strickland
Cuellar	McCarthy	Stupak
Cummings	McCollum (MN)	Tancredo
Davis (AL)	McDermott	Tanner
Davis (CA)	McGovern	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	McIntyre	Taylor (MS)
Davis (TN)	McKinney	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Meehan	Tierney
Dicks	Meek (FL)	Towns
Dingell	Meeke (NY)	Udall (CO)
Doggett	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Doyle	Menendez	Van Hollen
Edwards	Michaud	Velázquez
Emanuel	Millender-	Visclosky
Engel	McDonald	Wasserman
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Etheridge	Miller, George	Waters
Evans	Mollohan	Watson
Farr	Moore (KS)	Watt
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Filner	Murtha	Weiner
Ford	Nadler	Wexler
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Wu
Green, Al	Oberstar	Wynn
Green, Gene	Obey	
Grijalva	Oliver	

NOES—212

Aderholt	Buyer	Doolittle
Akin	Calvert	Drake
Alexander	Camp	Dreier
Bachus	Cannon	Duncan
Baker	Cantor	Emerson
Barrett (SC)	Capito	English (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Carter	Everett
Barton (TX)	Castle	Ferguson
Bass	Chabot	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Beauprez	Choccola	Flake
Biggert	Coble	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Cole (OK)	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Conaway	Fox
Blunt	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Boehlert	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Culberson	Garrett (NJ)
Bonilla	Cunningham	Gerlach
Bonner	Davis (KY)	Gilchrest
Boozman	Davis, Jo Ann	Gillmor
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Gingrey
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)	Gohmert
Brown (SC)	DeLay	Goode
Brown-Waite,	Dent	Goodlatte
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Green (WI)
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gutknecht

Harris	Marchant	Rogers (KY)
Hart	Marshall	Rogers (MI)
Hastings (WA)	McCaul (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
Hayes	McCrery	Royce
Hayworth	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Hefley	McHugh	Ryun (KS)
Hensarling	McKeon	Sanchez, Loretta
Herger	McMorris	Saxton
Hobson	Mica	Schwarz (MI)
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Holt	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Shadegg
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Hunter	Murphy	Sherwood
Hyde	Musgrave	Shimkus
Inglis (SC)	Myrick	Shuster
Issa	Neugebauer	Simmons
Istook	Ney	Smith (NJ)
Jindal	Northup	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Sodrel
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Stearns
Jones (NC)	Osborne	Sweeney
Keller	Otter	Taylor (NC)
Kelly	Oxley	Terry
Kennedy (MN)	Paul	Thomas
King (IA)	Pearce	Thornberry
King (NY)	Pence	Tiahrt
Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
Kirk	Petri	Turner
Kline	Pickering	Upton
Knollenberg	Pitts	Waldeen (OR)
Kolbe	Platts	Walsh
Kuhl (NY)	Poe	Wamp
LaHood	Pombo	Weldon (FL)
Latham	Porter	Weldon (PA)
LaTourette	Price (GA)	Weller
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Westmoreland
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Wicker
Linder	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)
LoBiondo	Regula	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rehberg	Wolf
Lungren, Daniel	Reichert	Young (AK)
E.	Renzi	Young (FL)
Mack	Reynolds	
	Rogers (AL)	

NOT VOTING—32

Baird	Ehlers	Lantos
Berkley	Feeney	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Foley	McCotter
Bono	Fossella	Moran (VA)
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Portman
Burton (IN)	Galleghy	Rohrabacher
Costa	Gibbons	Roybal-Allard
Cox	Granger	Shays
Davis (FL)	Graves	Simpson
DeFazio	Israel	Sullivan
Delahunt	Jenkins	

□ 1222

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. DOOLITTLE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 10 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 211, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—182

Abercrombie Green, Al
Ackerman Green, Gene
Allen Gutierrez
Andrews Ortiz
Baca Hastings (FL)
Baldwin Herseth
Bishop (GA) Higgins
Bishop (NY) Pascarell
Blumenauer Hinchey
Boren Hinojosa
Boswell Holden
Boucher Jackson (IL)
Boyd Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA) (TX)
Brown (OH) Jefferson
Brown, Corrine Jones (OH)
Butterfield Kanjorski
Capps Kaptur
Capuano Kennedy (RI)
Cardin Kildee
Cardoza Kilpatrick (MI)
Carnahan Kind
Carson Kucinich
Case Langevin
Chandler Larsen (WA)
Clay Larson (CT)
Cleaver Lee
Clyburn Levin
Conyers Lewis (GA)
Cooper Lipinski
Costello Lofgren, Zoe
Cramer Costello
Crowley Lynch
Cuellar Maloney
Cummins Markey
Davis (AL) Matheson
Davis (CA) McCarthy
Davis (IL) McCollum (MN)
Davis (TN) McDermott
DeGette McGovern
DeLauro McIntyre
Dicks McKinney
Dingell Meehan
Doggett Meek (FL)
Doyle Meeks (NY)
Edwards Melancon
Emanuel Menendez
Engel Michaud
Eshoo Millender-
Etheridge McDonald
Evans Miller (NC)
Farr Miller, George
Fattah Mollohan
Filner Murtha
Ford Nadler
Gonzalez Napolitano
Gordon Neal (MA)
Oberstar

NOES—211

Aderholt Buyer
Akin Calvert
Alexander Camp
Bachus Cannon
Baker Cantor
Barrett (SC) Capito
Bartlett (MD) Carter
Barton (TX) Castle
Bass Chabot
Beauprez Chocola
Biggert Coble
Bishop (UT) Cole (OK)
Blackburn Conaway
Blunt Cox
Boehlert Crenshaw
Boehner Culberson
Bonilla Cunningham
Bonner Davis (KY)
Boozman Davis, Jo Ann
Bradley (NH) Davis, Tom
Brady (TX) Deal (GA)
Brown (SC) DeLay
Brown-Waite, Dent
Ginny Diaz-Balart, L.
Burgess Diaz-Balart, M.

Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Muggrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadeegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—40

Baird
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bono
Boustany
Burton (IN)
Costa
Cubin
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Ehlers
Foley
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gohmert
Granger
Graves
Grijalva
Harman
Hayes
Israel
Jenkins
Lantos
Manzullo
McCotter
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Schiff
Shays
Simpson
Sullivan
Waters

□ 1229

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 11, Crowley No. 3, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform you that I was absent for rollcall vote No. 10 and rollcall vote No. 11 on January 26, 2005. These votes were on amendments to H.R. 54, the Congressional Gold Medal Enhancement Act of 2005.

I respectfully request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that if present, I would have voted: Rollcall vote No. 10, on the Crowley amendment—“no”; rollcall vote No. 11, on the Crowley amendment—“no.”

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 54) to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 42, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Crowley of New York moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 54, to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 19 and insert the following new paragraph:

“(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may not strike a congressional gold medal for presentation posthumously on behalf of any individual except during the 20-year period beginning 5 years after the death of the individual (unless the Act of Congress authorizing the striking of such medal was enacted before the death of such individual).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1230

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we begin the 109th Congress in earnest, and we do so by considering a bill that we do not need to act on for a problem that, in our view and in the view of many of my colleagues, simply does not exist. We considered this bill today not in the spirit of openness and bipartisanship that should categorize the democratic debate in the House, but with a restrictive rule that did not allow us to have a debate on a key issue: whether one of the highest honors that can be bestowed upon citizens of our country for their extraordinary deeds, a Congressional Gold Medal, can be awarded to one individual or more for their collective honorable or heroic actions.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes in its current form, not only would it limit medals to two per year, but it would prevent the House of Representatives and the Senate from awarding medals in the future to any group of individuals for their collective heroic deeds,

such as those of the hundreds of first responders that perished in the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

I am puzzled why we would act to impose such limits on our own ability to recognize the accomplishments of the citizens that we are elected to represent. And I am even more puzzled that we would fix a process that is not broken, that is bipartisan in nature, and that works remarkably well for all Members.

The bipartisan process we have in place has allowed us to honor the Reverend Martin Luther King and Coretta Scott King; Nancy and Ronald Reagan; Betty and Gerald Ford; Pope John Paul II; the Little Rock Nine; the leaders of Brown v. The Board of Education; Jackie Robinson; civil rights leader Dorothy Height; the Navajo Code Talkers; General Henry Shelton; Charles Schulz; John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York; Father Theodore Hesburgh; Rosa Parks; Nelson Mandela; Mother Teresa; Frank Sinatra; Ruth and Billy Graham; Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew; British Prime Minister Tony Blair; and others.

But under this bill, Mr. Speaker, we may not be able to honor Nancy and Ronald Reagan jointly, nor Betty and Gerald Ford jointly, nor Martin Luther King and Coretta Scott King jointly, nor the Little Rock Nine, nor the Navajo Code Talkers. And under this bill my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), will be prevented from honoring the fallen astronauts from the space shuttle Columbia.

In the 108th Congress the gentlewoman from Texas worked hard to gain the requisite two-thirds cosponsorship of the House for a bill that would honor these fallen American heroes posthumously with the Congressional Gold Medal. It is only right that the rule of the House be honored and that her hard-won efforts be not undone by this bill.

Since the majority party gained control of this House in 1995, 20 gold medals have been enacted into law either to an individual or a group of individuals. Using the process we currently have in place, 10 gold medal bills out of 20 were sponsored by Republican Members, and 10 were sponsored by Democratic Members. How can anyone possibly argue that the existing process does not work? We are fixing something that simply is not broken.

Unfortunately, the bipartisan spirit that has characterized the House's consideration of gold medals in the past has not carried over to the debate on this bill. Not only did we do not have an open rule, but today represents the first time this House is debating this issue in any form. The committee responsible for legislation on this bill, the Committee on Financial Services, on which I serve, has not held a single hearing on this bill, let alone a markup.

The limited debate over this bill on the House floor may culminate in the

passing of a bad bill, unless my colleagues join me in voting in favor of sending this bill back to committee, where we can have a meaningful debate, and where we can determine whether limiting gold medals is truly in the interest of the public and in the interest of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House has become the 109th Congress on a bad note: We are considering a bill with almost no meaningful debate, and it proposes to represent a solution to a problem that simply does not exist, a problem the record shows does not exist. Does this action foretell what lies ahead in terms of the existence of bipartisanship throughout this Congress?

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing, to vote in favor of my motion to recommit this bill back to the Committee on Financial Services and to allow this House to take a closer look at this legislation to determine whether it really meets the interests of the American people.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that this is a motion with instructions, so it does not go back to the Committee on Financial Services, it would automatically come back to the floor.

Secondly, I want to applaud the gentleman from Delaware, who sponsored this legislation. The concept behind the gold medal, the highest award that the Congress can provide, has historically been given, historically, to an individual. The first individual was George Washington, even before the Declaration of Independence. Historically that was the case.

In the first 123 years of the existence of our country, only 45 medals were given out, all of them to individuals. Since that time, we have had a tenfold increase in the next subsequent 100 years. And the gentleman from Delaware is right, we need to reform the system.

There is bipartisanship in the existing system because it involves 290 cosponsors, so everybody gets an opportunity to weigh in on the importance of the medal. There is an opportunity now with commemorative coins to honor groups as opposed to the individual medal. So the gentleman from Delaware needs to be congratulated on forward-looking reforms, just as he did in the commemorative coin program.

This is an effort, really, to gut these reforms, this so-called motion to recommit, and that is why I oppose it. We had extensive debate during general debate, as well as the two amendments offered by my friend from New York, and so I would ask that the motion to recommit be defeated; that we pass this legislation; and then get on to the work of defining two medals each year, a maximum of two medals each year, four for the Congress, to honor individ-

uals who have had extraordinary contributions to our country.

Let us go back to what the original intent of the Founding Fathers was in this gold medal. I think it is important to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 217, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie	Green, Al	Moore (WI)
Ackerman	Green, Gene	Murtha
Allen	Grijalva	Nadler
Andrews	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Baca	Harman	Neal (MA)
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Barrow	Herseth	Obey
Bean	Higgins	Oliver
Becerra	Hinchey	Ortiz
Berman	Hinojosa	Owens
Berry	Holden	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hooley	Payne
Boren	Hoyer	Pelosi
Boswell	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Reyes
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Capps	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Cardin	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sabo
Carnahan	Kind	Salazar
Carson	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Case	Langevin	T.
Chandler	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Larson (CT)	Sanders
Cleaver	Lee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Levin	Schwartz (PA)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Cramer	Lowey	Sherman
Crowley	Lynch	Skelton
Cuellar	Maloney	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Markey	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Marshall	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Solis
Davis (TN)	McCarthy	Spratt
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Stark
DeLauro	McDermott	Strickland
Dicks	McGovern	Stupak
Dingell	McIntyre	Tanner
Doggett	McKinney	Tauscher
Doyle	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	Meehan	Thompson (CA)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Eshoo	Melancon	Towns
Etheridge	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Evans	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Farr	Millender	Van Hollen
Fattah	McDonald	Velázquez
Filner	Miller (NC)	Vislosky
Ford	Miller, George	Wasserman
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Schultz
Gordon	Moore (KS)	Waters

Watson
Watt
Waxman

Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey

Wu
Wynn

□ 1302

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 12 I was in the Chamber seeking recognition but the vote was closed. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 173, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

AYES—231

NAYS—217

Aderholt Gillmor Nussle
Akin Gingrey Osborne
Alexander Gohmert Otter
Bachus Goode Oxley
Baker Goodlatte Paul
Barrett (SC) Green (WI) Pearce
Bartlett (MD) Gutknecht Pence
Barton (TX) Hall Peterson (PA)
Bass Harris Petri
Beauprez Hart Pickering
Biggart Hastings (WA) Pitts
Bishop (UT) Hayes Platts
Blunt Hayworth Poe
Boehlert Hefley Pombo
Boehner Hensarling Pomeroy
Bonilla Herger Porter
Bonner Hobson Portman
Boozman Hoekstra Price (GA)
Boustany Hostettler Pryce (OH)
Bradley (NH) Hulshof Putnam
Brady (TX) Hunter Radanovich
Brown (SC) Hyde Ramstad
Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC) Regula
Ginny Issa Rehberg
Burgess Istook Reichert
Buyer Jindal Renzi
Calvert Johnson (CT) Reynolds
Camp Johnson (IL) Rogers (AL)
Cannon Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY)
Cantor Jones (NC) Rogers (MI)
Capito Keller Ros-Lehtinen
Carter Kelly Royce
Castle Kennedy (MN) Ryan (WI)
Chabot King (IA) Ryun (KS)
Chocola King (NY) Saxton
Coble Kingston Schwarz (MI)
Cole (OK) Kirk Sensenbrenner
Conaway Kline Sessions
Cox Knollenberg Shadegg
Crenshaw Kolbe Shaw
Cubin Kuhl (NY) Sherwood
Culberson LaHood Shimkus
Cummings Latham Shuster
Cunningham LaTourette Simmons
Davis (KY) Leach Smith (NJ)
Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (CA) Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom Lewis (KY) Sodrel
Deal (GA) Linder Souder
DeLay LoBiondo Stearns
Dent Lucas Sweeney
Diaz-Balart, L. Lungren, Daniel Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, M. E. Taylor (NC)
Doolittle Mack Terry
Drake Marchant Thomas
Dreier McCaul (TX) Thornberry
Duncan McCrery Tiahrt
Emerson McHenry Tiberi
English (PA) McHugh Turner
Everett McKeon Upton
Feeney McMorris Walden (OR)
Ferguson Mica Walsh
Fitzpatrick (PA) Miller (FL) Wamp
Flake Miller (MI) Weldon (FL)
Forbes Miller, Gary Weldon (PA)
Fortenberry Moran (KS) Weller
Fossella Murphy Westmoreland
Foxx Musgrave Whitfield
Franks (AZ) Myrick Wicker
Frelinghuysen Neugebauer Wilson (NM)
Garrett (NJ) Ney Wilson (SC)
Gerlach Northup Wolf
Gibbons Norwood Young (AK)
Gilchrest Nunes Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Baird Ehlers Manzullo
Berkley Foley McCotter
Bilirakis Frank (MA) Moran (VA)
Blackburn Gallegly Rohrabacher
Bono Granger Roybal-Allard
Burton (IN) Graves Schiff
Costa Israel Shays
Davis (FL) Jenkins Simpson
DeFazio Kaptur Sullivan
Delahunt Lantos

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in the vote.

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Sodrel
Souders
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner

NOES—173

Abercrombie Harman Oberstar
Ackerman Hastings (FL) Obey
Allen Herseht Olver
Andrews Higgins Ortiz
Baca Hinchey Owens
Baldwin Hinojosa Pallone
Barrow Honda Pascrell
Bean Hooley Pastor
Becerra Hoyer Payne
Berman Hulshof Pelosi
Berry Inslee Pomeroy
Bishop (GA) Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
Bishop (NY) Jackson-Lee Rahall
Blumenauer (TX) Rangel
Boren Jefferson Reyes
Boswell Johnson, E. B. Ross
Boucher Jones (OH) Rothman
Brown (OH) Kennedy (RI) Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine Kildee Rush
Butterfield Kilpatrick (MI) Ryan (OH)
Capps Kind Sabo
Capuano King (NY) Salazar
Cardin Kucinich Sanchez, Linda
Cardoza Langevin T.
Carnahan Larsen (WA) Sanders
Carson Larson (CT) Schakowsky
Chandler Lee Scott (GA)
Clay Levin Scott (VA)
Cleaver Lewis (GA) Serrano
Clyburn Lipinski Sherman
Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Skelton
Cooper Lowey Slaughter
Costello Lynch Snyder
Cramer Maloney Solis
Crowley Markey Spratt
Cuellar Matheson Stark
Cummings McCarthy Strickland
Davis (AL) McCollum (MN) Tanner
Davis (CA) McDermott Tauscher
Davis (IL) McGovern Thompson (CA)
DeGette McIntyre Thompson (MS)
DeLauro McKinney Tierney
Dicks McNulty Towns
Dingell Meehan Udall (CO)
Doggett Meek (FL) Udall (NM)
Doyle Meeks (NY) Van Hollen
Emanuel Melancon Velázquez
Engel Menendez Visclosky
Etheridge Michaud Wasserman
Evans Millender Schultz
Farr McDonald Waters
Filner Miller (NC) Watson
Ford Miller, George Watt
Gibbons Mollohan Waxman
Gonzalez Moore (KS) Weiner
Gordon Moore (WI) Wexler
Green, Al Nadler Woolsey
Grijalva Napolitano Wu
Gutierrez Neal (MA) Wynn

NOT VOTING—29

Baird Delahunt Manzullo
Berkley Ehlers McCotter
Bilirakis Foley Moran (VA)
Bono Frank (MA) Rohrabacher
Burton (IN) Gallegly Roybal-Allard
Carter Granger Schiff
Costa Graves Shays
Davis (FL) Israel Simpson
Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins Sullivan
DeFazio Lantos

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1312

So the bill was passed.

Aderholt Everett Leach
Akin Fattah Lewis (CA)
Alexander Feeney Lewis (KY)
Bachus Ferguson Linder
Baker Fitzpatrick (PA) LoBiondo
Barrett (SC) Flake Lucas
Bartlett (MD) Forbes Lungren, Daniel
Barton (TX) Fortenberry E.
Bass Fossella Mack
Beauprez Foxx Marchant
Biggart Franks (AZ) Marshall
Bishop (UT) Frelinghuysen McCaul (TX)
Blackburn Garrett (NJ) McCrery
Blunt Gerlach McHenry
Boehlert Gilchrest McHugh
Boehner Gillmor McKeon
Bonilla Gingrey McMorris
Bonner Gohmert Mica
Boozman Goode Miller (FL)
Boustany Goodlatte Miller (MI)
Boyd Green (WI) Miller, Gary
Bradley (NH) Green, Gene Moran (KS)
Brady (PA) Gutknecht Murphy
Brady (TX) Hall Murtha
Brown (SC) Harris Musgrave
Brown-Waite, Hart Myrick
Ginny Hastings (WA) Neugebauer
Burgess Hayes Ney
Buyer Hayworth Northup
Calvert Hefley Norwood
Camp Hensarling Nunes
Cannon Herger Nussle
Cantor Hobson Osborne
Capito Otter Osbourne
Case Holden Oxley
Castle Holt Paul
Chabot Hostettler Pearce
Chocola Hunter Pence
Coble Hyde Peterson (MN)
Cole (OK) Inglis (SC) Peterson (PA)
Conaway Issa Petri
Cox Istook Pickering
Crenshaw Jindal Pitts
Cubin Johnson (CT) Platts
Culberson Johnson (IL) Poe
Cunningham Johnson, Sam Pombo
Davis (KY) Jones (NC) Porter
Davis (TN) Kanjorski Portman
Davis, Tom Kaptur Price (GA)
Deal (GA) Keller Pryce (OH)
DeLay Kelly Putnam
Dent Kennedy (MN) Radanovich
Diaz-Balart, L. King (IA) Ramstad
Diaz-Balart, M. Kingston Regula
Doolittle Kirk Rehberg
Drake Kline Reichert
Dreier Knollenberg Renzi
Duncan Kolbe Reynolds
Edwards Kuhl (NY) Rogers (AL)
Emerson LaHood Rogers (KY)
English (PA) Latham Rogers (MI)
Eshoo LaTourette Ros-Lehtinen

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 11, 12, and 13, I would have voted "aye" on 11, "aye" on 12, and "no" on 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC, and therefore unable to be on the House floor for rollcall votes 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Had I been here I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 10, "no" on rollcall vote 11, "no" on rollcall vote 12, and "aye" on rollcall vote 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, I was participating in the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, and, therefore, missed four votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on recorded vote No. 10, "no" on recorded vote No. 11, "no" on recorded vote No. 12 and "yes" on recorded vote No. 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to participate in floor proceedings on January 25–26, 2005 as I was in Poland as part of a Congressional Delegation to the ceremonies honoring the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. As a result I missed rollcall votes 8–13. On rollcall No. 8, passage of H. Con. Res 16, congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff Presidential election on December 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as President of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform, I would have voted "Yes" had I been present. On rollcall No. 9; regarding commending countries and organizations for marking the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and urging a strengthening of the fight against racism, intolerance, bigotry, prejudice, discrimination, and anti-Semitism, I would have voted "yes" had I been present. On rollcall No. 10, Crowley of New York Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 54, I would have voted "yes" had I been present. On rollcall No. 11, Crowley of New York Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 54, I would have voted "yes" had I been present. On rollcall No. 12, a motion to recommit H.R. 54, to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals, I would have voted "yes" had I been present. On rollcall No. 13, H.R. 54, to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide reasonable standards for congressional gold medals, I would have voted "yes" had I been present.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 49, ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Resolution 49, the Clerk be directed to make the following correction:

In the paragraph regarding the Committee on Financial Services, strike "Gene Green of Texas" and insert in lieu thereof "Al Green of Texas".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of inquiring of him the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, the House will convene at 10 a.m. This is a slow time of year, as most committees are not organizing until next week. We anticipate consideration of a resolution that will stress the House's views on the recent court decision regarding the Solomon amendment, but we do not expect to consider any significant legislation under a rule.

In addition, I would like to remind all Members that the President's State of the Union is scheduled for Wednesday night of next week.

Finally, to accommodate scheduling demands next week similar to those that we have this week, the House will not have votes next Thursday or Friday.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and will be happy to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the information.

I understand he anticipates a substantive resolution on the Solomon amendment and the court ruling thereon. But can I ask you, is it your understanding that a resolution regarding the recent Palestinian elections will come to the floor next week as well? Is that possible?

Mr. DELAY. I know that you and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) are working on this bill and will continue to work on it. It has every possibility if it is done, maybe we could do it next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader. I know that the majority whip and myself are working on this, and running it by your office as well as we are the leader's office on our side. Hopefully we can move that. I know that all of us believe that we have an opportunity to at least resolve the violence and hopefully reach towards a peaceful resolution of that dispute, and hopefully we can move forward on this resolution. I thank the leader for his response.

Secondly, Mr. Leader, the supplemental appropriation, we hear about the supplemental appropriation, clearly for the tsunami victims as well as further assistance to our troops and efforts in Iraq and in Afghanistan. Can you tell us whether or not there is any possibility of that coming next week, or do you anticipate that would be the week following or sometime thereafter?

Mr. DELAY. I am not sure that the White House has even made a decision on when they will send the request for the supplemental to us, or if they will send us one or two requests. I think those decisions are still being made by the White House. Obviously those decisions will help shape how and when we will consider the bill here in the House. At this time I do not expect us to consider the supplemental prior to the President's Day recess, but I would not rule that out, either. We will take the President's request, obviously our Appropriations Committee will do its work, and we will expedite the process and get it to the floor as soon as possible.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 49, ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Resolution 49, the Clerk be directed to make the following change:

In the paragraph regarding the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, strike "Mr. HIGGINS".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 21, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1315

VACATING ORDER OF HOUSE OF TODAY VARYING CLAUSE 11(a)(1) OF RULE X

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House by unanimous consent of today varying clause 11(a)(1) of rule X be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING RULES OF HOUSE RE- LATING TO COMPOSITION OF PERMANENT SELECT COM- MITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 51) amending the Rules of the House relating to the composition of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 51

Resolved, In clause 11(a)(1) of rule X—
(a) strike “18” and insert “21”; and (b) strike “10” and insert “12”.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 111

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 111.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HONORING JOHNNY CARSON

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be dis-

charged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 40) honoring the career and philanthropic contributions of Johnny Carson, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 40

Whereas Johnny Carson was born as John William Carson on October 23, 1925, in Corning, Iowa, to Homer “Kit” and Ruth Carson;

Whereas Johnny Carson moved with his family to Norfolk, Nebraska, in 1933, served his country as a Navy ensign during World War II, and received a bachelor of arts degree in radio and speech in 1949 from the University of Nebraska;

Whereas Johnny Carson became known as the “King of Late Night” as he entertained millions of Americans from 1962 until 1992 as the host of “The Tonight Show”;

Whereas Johnny Carson won six Emmy Awards, was inducted into the Television Hall of Fame in 1987, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1992, and received the Kennedy Center Lifetime Achievement Award in 1993;

Whereas Johnny Carson continued to recognize his Midwestern roots by generously donating millions of dollars to communities and institutions in Nebraska and Iowa;

Whereas the United States was saddened by the death of Johnny Carson on January 23, 2005, at the age of 79: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Johnny Carson for making us laugh and for his many philanthropic contributions; and

(2) expresses its deepest sympathy and condolences to his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will not take that much time.

I want to rise in support of House Resolution 40 that honors the life and career of Johnny Carson. Mr. Speaker, the former Tonight Show host passed away on Sunday after 13 years of retirement at the age of 79. His show delighted viewers every weeknight for three decades during an incomparable late-night run from October of 1962 until May of 1992.

Much has been said in recent days about Johnny Carson, and rightfully so. Carson’s career was extremely decorated. He was a six-time Emmy Award winner and a member of the Television Hall of Fame. Carson was also awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1992, and he received the Kennedy Center Lifetime Achievement Award in 1993.

But, undoubtedly, Johnny Carson’s greatest accomplishment was in making millions of people laugh at the end of days that were not always that funny. The Tonight Show aired during a period that included some of the

most sobering events in American history: the Civil Rights Movement; the Vietnam War; the Watergate saga; the assassinations of President Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., to name a few. Johnny Carson’s grace through his 30 years was as important to his longevity as was his sense of humor.

Since his Tonight Show in 1992, Americans everywhere have longed for his return. His personal life was always intensely private; so we have seen or heard little of him over the last 13 years. With his passing on Sunday, we know we will never see Johnny Carson. And as David Letterman, whose own program followed the Tonight Show each night for 10 years, said this week, “We will not see the like of him again,” either.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), our new colleague.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday America lost a brilliant entertainer, a gifted comedian, and a generous philanthropist. Johnny Carson, who passed away at the age of 79, lived much of his life in California, but he never forgot his Nebraska roots. Johnny Carson was born in Corning, Iowa, but at the age of 8, he and his family moved to Norfolk, Nebraska, a community which continues to embrace him.

Johnny Carson graduated from Norfolk High School in 1943, and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that is where he happened not to make the cheerleader squad three times. He then served his country as an ensign in the Navy during World War II. He attended the University of Nebraska and graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in radio and speech in 1949.

Although much attention has been paid in recent days to the impact that Johnny Carson had on television, I would like to focus on his generosity, which took on many forms. The list of his financial contributions to communities and institutions is very impressive. It seemed that whenever a project in the Norfolk area was short of funds, Johnny Carson came to the rescue. But he did it in his trademark modest and unassuming style, and, in fact, many of his donations were made anonymously.

Over the years he developed an impressive philanthropic legacy. He gave \$2.27 million for the Cancer Radiation Center in Norfolk, \$1 million for the Lifelong Learning Center at Northeast Community College, \$600,000 to the Norfolk Public Schools for the Johnny Carson Theater, and \$500,000 for the Norfolk Library Foundation. He gave to numerous other projects both in Nebraska and Iowa.

Johnny Carson also did not forget his alma mater. Last year he donated \$5.3 million to renovate and expand the Temple Building, which houses the University of Nebraska-Lincoln theater department. He also provided funding for four merit-based scholarships and donated millions of dollars toward the

construction of the Lied Center for the Performing Arts at the University.

In 1988, he explained his generosity by saying, "I have always felt that if you're lucky enough in this life to accumulate enough funds to live better than you have the right to, then you have a moral obligation to pay back to the community or to the country or to the place that brought you up."

Nebraska was truly fortunate that it was the place that brought him up. We as a Nation were fortunate to have a man that made so many people laugh. Johnny Carson's generosity to the State will continue to provide benefits for future generations. And for those who remember, his personality will live on in our hearts.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And without deference to the origins of the Speaker or to the other gentleman from Nebraska, I rise today to reclaim Johnny Carson as a loyal Iowan and a favorite son of the great State of Iowa, who migrated to the West across the Missouri River and made his home over on the Nebraska side. Iowa has much to be proud about, and Johnny Carson is one of those rare gems that will certainly be missed.

Johnny was born as John William Carson on October 23, 1925, in Corning, Iowa, down in mighty Adams County to a Homer, "Kit," and his mother Ruth Carson. A few years later he attended kindergarten in Red Oak, Iowa. He has not forgotten his roots at Red Oak either.

No comic has been able to duplicate the comfortable format that Carson emitted to his audiences nightly. As Harold Meyerson puts it, he was the "country boy who had become the urban hipster." In Corning, Iowa, everyone knows everyone, and Johnny brought that same small town feeling to Americans who watched him every evening.

And although he moved to Nebraska, Carson never forgot his Iowa roots. His generosity through the John W. Carson Foundation will be long remembered in Iowa. One such example is his support for providing classroom and rehearsal space at the Performing Arts and Education Association of Southwest Iowa, which is located at Red Oak. He understood what it was like to grow up in rural Iowa, and he understood rural America. And those people down in that region had not had access to performance amenities until Johnny made his contribution.

So in keeping with the spirit of the person whom everyone in America loved, he really did not just belong to Iowa or just belong to Nebraska, but Johnny Carson belonged to America. And he would be quite pleased if I took this opportunity to also reclaim Secretary of Agriculture Mike Johanns as an Iowan and also reclaim Roger Craig,

great running back from Davenport, Iowa, who slid his way through Lincoln and went on to win three Super Bowl rings in San Francisco. There are others. And I appreciate the life of Johnny Carson and the spirit that he brought to this great country.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for composing this resolution, and I thank my colleagues for their comments.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 40, a resolution honoring the career and philanthropic contribution of Johnny Carson. I want to thank Congressman FORTENBERRY for joining me in introducing this timely resolution, and I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in honoring an American legend.

Mr. Carson, known to millions around the world simply as "Johnny," was not only the king of late-night comedy, but a true American icon whose wit and social commentary help defined generations of American entertainment and popular culture. During his 30-year reign of late night, he commanded the loyalty of millions of television viewers. He did this not just by being a gifted comedian, but by being everyone's favorite next-door neighbor, who always knew how to put his audiences at ease. His jokes on politics were always sharp and perceptive, but never below the belt. His monologues reflected the pulse of our Nation. He is and always will be the fabric of American society.

Johnny brought heartland values with him to show business, and he departed a class act. After he finished his final show in 1992, he never returned for guest appearances or prime-time specials. Instead, Johnny demonstrated his well known sincerity by letting his remarkable achievements speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to pay tribute to this great American icon, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 40.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MEETING WITH IRAQI WOMEN CANDIDATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I traveled with the Iraqi Women's Caucus members, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Tauscher) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) to meet with Iraqi women to discuss election procedures.

We held the meeting in Amman, Jordan. These were women who were candidates for the January 30, 2005, elections in Iraq. And it seems kind of strange that we would be training them in election procedures, how to campaign, when certainly that is a very different place, and the elections are being held in a war zone, and it is very difficult for candidates to get their name out, to even have their picture out and so that they are on lists which provides for the different groups. The women were from all different parties that are involved in the election. There are over 100 parties.

We had 20 of these women that came to discuss the elections. But we were so amazed and so impressed with the caliber of women. They are educated, articulate, well spoken, and at least five of them have Ph.Ds. But they are not only running for election, where we talk about how you have to speak against opponents, and you might say that you are going to really kill each other; they are actually putting their life on the line. So many of them have been intimidated. They have been threatened. One of the women has lost her 17-year old son along with her guard. Last week there was an assassination attempt on her again with four insurgents dressed as Iraqi policemen. Fortunately, they did not succeed, and she is still running.

One woman had been kidnapped and held for ransom and was finally released. Another woman lost her son. Another woman had five family members who have been killed just recently. And yet they are willing. Because they believe so much in democracy, they are willing to put their names on a list to be elected.

And fortunately for the women of Iraq, this is a national constituent type of election, and so it is not what we think of as having districts or provinces. But there is a list of the different parties, so people will have one

vote for the list, and then the number of people that are elected will receive—will be included in the government that is being elected and will have the opportunity to write the Constitution. But it was decided by the transitional government that women would be included, and that 25 percent of those who are elected will be women. And the way that that was done is that every third name on the list is a woman.

So we had the opportunity to meet for several days with these women, and the longer we met, the more engaged everybody became. You could have really very frank discussions. So many times when we go over there, it is just for a meeting of very short time. You never really got to know the women.

There have also been women that have come over here to work with us. But despite the differences in the women, they were Shiites, Sunnis, Kurds, independents and Christians, that they had not really discussed political issues with each other, and what we were able to do was to be able to facilitate and help them develop the tools and the skills to be able to work together and realize that politics really is the art of compromise. Some of them were very rigid in what they believe should be done, but they were able to see that you need to discuss, and it is very important to have a majority party, but also to have a minority party.

□ 1330

Even the Sunni women that were there, who came in wanting to postpone the elections because their areas are obviously unsafe, they still want to participate. What all of the women told us was that they need to have everyone participate, all the different groups. Many of them, even within the different groups, are divided into other groups.

But we were really able to discuss this with them, and I think they went away with a positive reinforcement of how to deal with that. What we came away with was such a feeling of how important it is, how they view the democracy that we have and the freedoms that we have and how they really want to have the same type of thing.

Now, these elections are really only the first step in them reaching democracy, and they will be able to write their constitution and form an interim government. The constitution will have to be written by August 15, which is a very short time. The interim government will take effect, and then they will have a slate for eventual election of the permanent officers who will govern in December of 2005. But they are on their way.

One thing that they said to us is, The U.S., we think of them as occupiers, but please do not leave us until the job is done. We need you there. We really need to have a democracy. And they are willing to give their life for it.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate them and wish them well on their election.

SMART SECURITY AND THE CASE FOR LEAVING IRAQ, PART 2

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States invasion and occupation of Iraq violate America's core values of honesty, responsibility, security, justice and freedom. This has been a dishonest war from the word go. The President said he had hard evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. It turns out he did not. To date, no weapons of mass destruction have been found. The President himself has officially called off the hunt.

Irresponsible behavior has been a guiding principle of the administration's behavior in leading the Nation to war in Iraq. Specifically, what has been the response of our leaders when they have been exposed for misleading the country, or for sending American men and women to their deaths without imminent threat to American security, or what has been the response for keeping our National Guard troops in Iraq for many months longer than they had agreed, or for signing off on orders that led to torture in American prisons?

Our leaders do not take responsibility for their failures. Instead, they change the subject, make excuses, or worst of all, blame an underling. Not a single administration official has resigned as a result of the mistakes that led us into this misguided and dangerous war. George Tenet received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, Alberto Gonzales and Condoleezza Rice are up for promotion, and Donald Rumsfeld is still the Secretary of Defense, although if he traveled to Germany, he could possibly be arrested as a war criminal.

The Iraq invasion has made the Middle East a more violent and unstable place, and it has made America less secure at home by creating a terrorist breeding ground in a country that was not a haven for Islamic fundamentalists before we invaded it. It seems too ironic to be true, but after our Nation was attacked on 9/11 by Islamic fundamentalists, the Bush administration's response was to bomb and kill civilians in one of the few countries in the Middle East that was actually inhospitable to Islamic fundamentalists.

Speaking of justice, there is no justice in an operation that has caused the deaths of over 1,400 Americans and untold thousands of Iraqis for the purely ideological reason that our leader did not like their leader. Nor do we serve the cause of freedom by killing innocent people in a country that did not ask for our help, by destroying a nation's roads, schools and hospitals; and in the process we have created a playground for Islamic fundamentalists.

Freedom is very important to Americans, and I believe that the President's recent inaugural address made a mock-

ery of the word "freedom." He should ask the people of Iraq, many of whom have suffered because they lost a loved one or had a friend maimed by foreign bullets, just how free do they feel today.

Some say that we have a responsibility to the people of Iraq to keep our troops there, that we not abandon them. This belief misses the point. Our very presence in Iraq is the cause of much of the violence.

We have a moral responsibility to leave in order to stem the violence. We owe this to the people of Iraq, who have been killed by the thousands and thousands. We owe it to our troops who are sitting ducks for terrorists. That is why later today I will introduce legislation calling for a withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Iraq.

In the 108th Congress I also introduced a SMART Security Resolution For the 21st Century, which calls for a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism. Adopting a smart approach to foreign policy will help us avoid the many mistakes that have characterized the war in Iraq.

By supporting my call to bring the troops home, we will send a message to the President, one, asking that he develop and implement a plan to begin the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq; two, develop and implement a plan for the reconstruction of Iraq's civil and economic infrastructure; three, convene an emergency meeting of Iraq's leadership, Iraq's neighbors, the United Nations, and the Arab League to create an international peacekeeping force in Iraq and to replace U.S. military forces with Iraqi police and national guard forces to ensure Iraq's security; and, finally, take all necessary steps to provide the Iraqi people the opportunity to completely control their own internal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we pursued a SMART security strategy for America, and we must do this by withdrawing our troops from Iraq. It is not too late to make the smart choice, the right choice, the choice to bring our troops home.

REPORT ON EVENTS IN SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this month we witnessed the signing of the peace agreement in Nairobi, Kenya, between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Army. The signing of this agreement has ended Africa's longest running war, a brutal civil war that spanned 21 years where 2 million people died. I congratulate the parties for reaching this agreement.

I also want to commend President Bush, Secretary of State Powell and his team, Ambassador Danforth and all the outside groups for their unrelenting efforts in the support of peace.

I also want to commend all the countries that played a critical role in the

peace, particularly Norway and Kenya. Now all parties have to live up to the agreement and begin the task of rebuilding the lives of millions of people.

This would be a good time for the administration to appoint a strong acting ambassador to immediately go to Khartoum to help implement the peace agreement. This would not be to reward Khartoum, but to keep pressure on all parties to make sure the agreement sticks and to speak out on the issue of Darfur. There is nothing like being on the scene every day, all day. So much has gone into getting this agreement. We must do everything to make sure that it lasts.

It is also important as we look forward that we do not forget the tragedy still unfolding in Sudan. As I speak, women continue to be raped, children die from hunger and disease, men continue to be murdered by the government-sponsored Janjaweed, and new attacks continue to be launched against defenseless villages.

Many of these people have been huddled in camps for over a year. Put yourself in their shoes for a minute. You are uprooted from your home. You live in a refugee camp where conditions are terrible. You do not know if your family members are dead or alive. You are sick, weak, watching people die all around you from hunger and disease. Now picture you have been there for over a year.

The tsunami in South Asia demonstrates how quickly and effectively the world can respond to such terrible disasters. Once again, we are reminded that the world has failed the people of Darfur. I commend the quick and generous response to the tsunami, but we must not only focus on disasters as they occur, but also to respond to disasters like in Darfur that have gone on for decades.

The peace agreement between the north and south opens new doors for a comprehensive peace throughout the country; and Dr. John Garang, who will now be vice president of Sudan, has an opportunity to play a positive role and should go to Darfur to help bring about peace.

I have strongly supported the United States commitment to the United Nations. Since I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, all U.S. assessments to the U.N. have been paid in full. But over the past year, we have seen the United Nations fight an uphill battle on Darfur. Resolution after resolution has failed to have any impact. At least two Security Council members, China and Russia, have threatened to veto strong resolutions from being passed.

Secretary General Kofi Annan continues to report that the situation in Darfur continues to deteriorate and the Government of Sudan has violated the previous Security Council resolutions by failing to disarm and prosecute the Janjaweed.

NGOs are leaving the region. Secretary General Annan has sent a Commission on Inquiry to Darfur to investigate if genocide has occurred, and he has the report in his hands as I speak. Most people believe there is genocide. But whether or not they use that term, it still is horrible what is taking place. And no matter what you call it, the facts remain, innocent civilians are systematically being murdered, raped and displaced; and the world has failed to stop it.

It is time for the United Nations and the international community to respond in a meaningful way. I ask Secretary General Annan to go to Darfur to confirm with his own eyes that the situation has not improved. Then Secretary General Annan should make bold recommendations and call on the Security Council to immediately implement them, because a strong, meaningful resolution should be put forward and could make a difference.

It is now time for Secretary General Annan to use his strong moral leadership. He is a Nobel Peace Prize recipient and surely the Security Council would take his recommendations. He should use his power and prestige to plead for the people of Darfur. And if the Security Council fails to take meaningful action, Secretary General Annan should resign in protest.

I am not blaming Kofi Annan for Darfur. He does not control the Security Council. But I ask him to use his leadership to demand a new course of action from them. I believe these actions could turn the attention of the world back to what is taking place in Darfur.

Resigning under protest is an act of great moral leadership, and this world would respect his actions. Great men in history have given up their posts to force change. In 1973 at the height of the Watergate scandal, President Nixon ordered Attorney General Elliott Richardson to fire the special prosecutor. He refused and resigned in protest and later got the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

William Wilberforce, a member of the British Parliament, he could have been Prime Minister, but spoke out to abolish the slave trade, and gave up being Prime Minister of England. Anything Kofi Annan can do to get the world to focus on Darfur would be greatly admired.

Mr. Speaker, if in the year 2005 the Security Council cannot deal with genocide, the raping of women and the systematic burning of villages now occurring, then I believe it is fair to ask, what purpose is the United Nations serving in the 21st century?

Mr. Speaker, I close by adding that just yesterday the New York Times reported that villages continue to burn and that civilians are bearing the brunt of the violence in Darfur. Just last week fresh attacks killed over 100 people and drove thousands more from their homes.

Where is the international community? Something needs to be done now.

This past weekend I watched the movie "Hotel Rwanda." I urge you all to go see it. It is a movie about how the world stood by as almost a million people were slaughtered in Rwanda. The lead actor, Don Cheadle is nominated for an Oscar and the movie is nominated as best original screen play.

No one who sees that movie can leave not thinking about what is happening in Darfur. I end by asking the question . . . Who will play the leading role in Hotel Sudan?

NEEDED: CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to recognize the terrible tragedy that took place in my district this morning in the city of Glendale where a terrible train accident occurred.

I recently spoke with the Glendale fire chief, who informed me that the death toll has now risen to 10 from that accident. The investigation and the search effort continues. He did report to me that he was very impressed with the level of coordination of the relief agencies on the ground, the rescue agencies on the ground. I know they are doing everything humanly possible to help the victims of that terrible crash.

I also spoke with the mayor of Glendale this morning, very shaken from what he saw at the scene; and I asked him what we could do, what I could do, what our colleagues could do to help. He said just pray. Just pray.

□ 1345

I want to send my thoughts and prayers out to my Glendale and Los Angeles constituents and let them know that we will certainly do everything possible in any way, and I know my colleagues will join me in that.

I would also like to express my condolences as we mourn the loss of the 35 marines in Iraq today. To those whose loved ones were lost in the helicopter crash or in action today, our hearts, our thoughts, and our prayers are with you.

Over the past 2 days, we have learned that the President will be asking Congress for an additional \$80 billion supplemental appropriations to finance the war in Iraq and ongoing operations in Afghanistan. I support giving our troops all that they need to ensure their safety and to enable them to perform their missions, but for the past few months, I have been disturbed by continued reports that have detailed persistent shortages of up-armored Humvees in Iraq, especially given the repeated assurances by administration officials that everything that could be done about these shortages was being done. In fact, it appears this was not so.

It should not take a question from a GI in the field to spur the Secretary of

Defense to address critical shortfalls of equipment. That, Mr. Speaker, is our job. That is our job. Congress is charged with oversight of the executive branch, and I am deeply concerned that we have not been fulfilling that critical and institutional role. As a result, our troops are riding into battle in vehicles that are not adequately protected or are jury-rigged with so-called "hillbilly armor" lifted from scrap heaps.

Last May, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, the Republican chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, expressed his unease about the lack of oversight in Congress and admitted that legislative oversight was better when the Democrats controlled Congress. The majority in this Congress, Senator GRASSLEY acknowledged, "has delegated so much authority to the executive branch of government, and we ought to devote more time to oversight than we do."

The critical need for oversight is underscored by a new Government Accountability Office report outlining and updating its high-risk list. The new report lists 25 Federal programs that are vulnerable to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. Increasingly, the GAO also identified high-risk areas to focus on the need of broad-based transformations to address major economy, efficiency, or effectiveness challenges.

Of the 25 government operations and programs that comprise the GAO list, 8 are associated with the Department of Defense, the government's largest department. These include inventory management, weapons systems and acquisition, financial and contract management, personnel security clearance, management of military bases and other infrastructure, and modernization of computer systems.

The Comptroller General, David Walker, noted at a news conference yesterday that DOD's failure to rectify many of these problem areas results in billions of dollars of waste every year and inadequate accountability to the Congress and the American taxpayer.

I am not surprised to see a large number of DOD programs on the GAO's list. As an assistant U.S. attorney, I prosecuted defense contractor fraud. It was true then that if you throw enormous amounts of money at any department without adequate oversight, you would get tremendous amounts of fraud and abuse. Given the hundreds of billions of dollars in the DOD's annual budget, the potential for waste, the reality of waste, fraud, and abuse is enormous.

No amount of oversight and investigation will eliminate all instances of fraud, but that does not excuse our failure to try. I urge my colleagues, and especially my colleagues in the majority who alone have the power to call hearings, to subpoena witnesses, to take our oversight role more seriously. The American taxpayer and, more importantly, our men and women in uniform are relying upon us.

IN LOVING TRIBUTE TO JUDSON DANIEL "JD" DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is worthy of note when someone lights up the world with his or her own sunshine and gives us a glimpse of such a beautiful soul that it is more understandable why our Creator would endow us with the blessings He has. Such a person was a young man named Judson Daniel Davis, known to his friends as JD. He was 23 years old, after having experienced life fully every single year he was alive.

He was born in Tyler, Texas, on September 17, 1981, and he left for heaven on January 19, 2005. He was active in high school and in his church, which was Green Acres Baptist. He was constantly looking for ways to help others and to improve himself. Even at his young age, he had found that helping others somehow made him a more complete person. My own daughters knew him well, and even my wife and I felt quite comfortable when we knew one of our daughters would be with JD.

He graduated from Whitehouse High School in Smith County, Texas, after which he attended Tyler Junior College, earning an associate's degree in business, and then proceeded to Texas A&M University, obtaining a degree in finance. After Texas A&M, this unusual individual studied kinesiology and earned a degree at the University of Texas. It does take a rather unique individual to be both a Texas Aggie and a Texas Longhorn, and that is what JD was.

While at Texas University, he did not merely study, he also utilized his talent for playing musical instruments. He played the trombone in the Longhorns' basketball band in addition to performing with the Big Bertha crew. He began studying sports management in the UT program in Austin, and, during the Christmas break, he had talked about the potential for substitute teaching, because he loved to help others. His mother, Linda Davis, said, "He always had a smile, a kind word for everyone, and was always sensitive to the needs of others."

The Longhorn band was excited about coming to play for the President's inauguration this month, and none was more excited than JD. He had run a fever the week before the trip, but he told the university health personnel he did not want to miss the President's inauguration. He was coming. He did feel ill on the plane ride and did not get off the bus when the other students did here in Washington. They got off physically, but he had proceeded ahead of them in spirit. He was pronounced dead shortly thereafter.

He was looking forward to being an intern at Lake Hills Church in Austin, a position of which he had just learned about before he came to Washington. He was to start rehearsals when he re-

turned from Washington for a leading part in the play, "The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe." Just as he had been active in his work at Green Acres Baptist Church, he was determined to try to make as big an impact as he could, wherever he could. As if to subconsciously follow the admonition of David to number our days aright, JD numbered and filled every one. As a sign in his room said, "Life is short, so fish hard." His mother Linda said the picture and sign that most exemplified JD's life says, "The value of life lies not in the length of our days, but in the use we make of them."

JD brought life and hope and good news to so many. He truly lifted spirits by his presence and leaves us much in his physical absence. He loved his neighbors, he loved his President, he loved his country. He loved the visible and auditory beauty given us by the Creator. May others be inspired by the life, living, and giving of Judson Daniel Davis, and may his loved ones be comforted in that knowledge.

SEVENTY THOUSAND VICTIMS OF GENOCIDE IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring terrible news from Africa. Seventy thousand people are dead, and more are dying every hour. This would be tragic enough if the deaths were caused by some natural cataclysmic event like a tsunami. But the truth is the 70,000 in Africa have died because they were killed by a regime bent on genocide.

In a region of horrific tragedy, of violence and death, millions have lost their lives, but many have not lost their hope. These are the notes handwritten by members of the Sudanese refugees in the camps. They gave them to us when we were there 2 days ago and asked us to read them; pages upon pages of handwritten requests to Members of Congress, to the American people. I accepted them directly from these people walking away, because we could not spend all day there. They said, would you please take them home and read them? Their words, their hopes, their calls for help are being translated at the moment, and I will share them with my colleagues when they are done.

But I want to share my thoughts about Africa with some of my colleagues in the House, and with the American people. In the past week I was invited to join a congressional trip to the Sudan region by a Republican, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). I say this because this House and the American people need to know the depth and the breadth of a man who serves his constituency with distinction and his country with honor. The gentleman from California (Mr.

ROYCE) knows how to reach across the aisle, and I applaud him for his leadership and his humanity. He knows of my love and interest in Africa. That transcended any label of Republican or Democrat.

As chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, Mr. ROYCE put together a trip so that we could see firsthand what was happening. It was done in a 5-day period. The wheels never stopped rolling. There were a handful of House Members on the trip and also someone that the gentleman from California brought along by the name of Don Cheadle, who was recently nominated for a Best Actor Award for his part in the movie "Hotel Rwanda." It is galvanizing when one sees that movie, because it is so reminiscent of what is going on today. It went on 10 years ago in Rwanda. But in that film one sees with their own eyes with chilling accuracy what we saw on the ground in Chad. It will become an instrument of good, and for that we should be grateful.

I have been to Africa many times. I have seen the pandemic of AIDS. I lived in Africa as a doctor and as a psychiatrist. I know about the suffering and the emotional trauma from a tragedy of global proportions.

What we saw there was an old story. Here are 18,000 people living in makeshift houses in an area. There are 250,000 of them in Chad, having come across the border from Sudan. They have no running water. They have no toilets; they have latrines. Water has to be brought in by truck. You see old people, you see young people with amputations from having been bombed by the Sudanese Government. You see people who are there sick, crying, having no schools for the kids and no health care, or very little health care, all created by a regime that refuses to deal with the issue.

Now, we sat, many of us, on the floor of this House during the whole Rwanda experience. We watched it happen, but we kind of closed our eyes. We would not see what we were seeing. It could have been prevented. Everyone in this body ought to have to see that movie and see what happens when the United States, rather than leading, sits on its hands. We say we are a leader in the world. Well, there is a situation out there today that requires us to act.

Now, unfortunately, Chad is almost the poorest country in Africa. Sudan is a little bit better because they have oil. But these people living in Darfur are not involved in the oil. They are hundreds of miles away from it. So they become sort of irrelevant to the strategic purposes of this country.

If we are going to be a humanitarian country, and we want people to understand that we care, we have to act when we see things like this in spite of the fact that it has no economic value to us.

In the days ahead I am sure others will talk about this. America has been a leader and will be again. It is the right thing to do. We should act now.

□ 1400

CONGRESS WILL NOT ACCEPT A SOCIAL SECURITY FORMULA BASED ON RACE OR GENDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, if any of my colleagues were watching Meet the Press on Sunday, they may have seen a truly remarkable thing. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) proposed that Social Security benefits should be based on race and gender. If we take the distinguished chairman at his word, he is proposing overt race and gender discrimination by the government.

Apart from raising serious constitutional questions, this shocks the conscience. My colleagues can read excerpts from the transcript of his statement on Meet the Press in press clippings across the country and in Tuesday's Roll Call.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) said, Congress "needs to examine how many years of retirement you get based on your race and you ought not to leave gender off the table because that would be a factor."

Tim Russert, who seemed a bit taken aback by this, asked THOMAS, "So if someone is a woman and they live longer, they would get less per year?"

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) confirmed that is what he wants Congress to consider.

Then Russert asked, "Do you think Congress, Mr. Chairman, would accept any formula that said that people should be treated differently because of their gender or race?"

I can answer that question and I believe that I speak for many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the answer is a very strong no. We will never accept a Social Security formula based on race or gender.

I am confident that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this issue find this idea as repulsive as I do. This idea is unfair, it is unjust, it is profoundly anti-American. It goes against fundamental constitutional principles of equal protection. Congress must, and I believe will, repudiate it.

Social Security is the financial safety net for all working Americans in their old age; and all workers are entitled to its benefits, regardless of gender or race. Its formulas currently are race and gender neutral and must remain so for all time, I believe.

Regardless of what projections we each believe in for the long-term outlook of the trust fund, we must surely agree on the basic proposition that all retired workers are entitled to this essential government safety net without regard to gender or race. The chairman's proposal attacks the most vulnerable among us, those who need Social Security most, and that is wrong.

He proposes to cut every woman's annual Social Security benefits because

statistically women live longer than men, and that is just plain backwards. What are retired women supposed to do, live at a lower level of income payments than men?

On the contrary, women need Social Security even more than men do. We are a long way from closing the wage gap. We are currently 79 cents to the dollar, and that translates into an even wider pension gap. Retired women workers are twice as likely as men to depend on Social Security as their sole means of support and to depend on Social Security benefits to keep them out of poverty.

According to Joint Economic Committee figures and the National Women's Law Center, women are 60 percent of Social Security recipients at age 67 and three-quarters of the recipients at age 85 or older.

Hispanic women, for example, live the longest of all as a group. The gentleman from California's (Mr. THOMAS) logic would cut their benefits most. Yet more than half of retired Hispanic women depend on Social Security for 90 percent of their income and without it would live in poverty.

The chairman also proposed to adjust benefits based on race, and this is mindboggling. I am at a loss of words to explain how outrageous it is to propose basing any government benefit based on race.

Let me just remind the distinguished gentleman from California that the Constitution requires the Federal Government to treat persons of all races equally. His proposal raises very serious constitutional questions and undermines our moral commitment to our society in which all are treated equally, regardless of race.

I wish I could call the chairman's statements on Sunday ill considered and not serious, but that was not the first time the chairman has proposed such a policy, and I call on my colleagues to not accept it.

I am circulating a letter to the President of the United States. I will place it into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to support it and to send a strong message that basing any type of Social Security benefits on race and gender is unfair and just plain wrong. I will also add in the RECORD additional statements and some comments from around the country that have been in major papers.

JANUARY 26, 2005.

NO, MR. PRESIDENT, CONGRESS WILL NOT ACCEPT A SOCIAL SECURITY FORMULA BASED ON RACE OR GENDER

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We expect you were as shocked as we were to hear Ways & Means Chairman Thomas again propose on "Meet the Press" Sunday that Social Security benefits should be allocated based on race and gender. Cutting Social Security benefits to women and minorities—the retirees who need them the most—is wrong, unfair, unjust and fundamentally anti-American. We will not accept a formula that has such unfairness as its centerpiece.

We will be sending the attached letter to the president asking him to repudiate Thomas' proposal by taking his outrageous proposal to base Social Security benefits on

race and gender off the table. Please contact Eleni Constantine with Rep. Maloney at 5-7944 by 6 p.m. today if you would like to sign the letter.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Member of Congress.
FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 26, 2005.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We were appalled to hear Ways & Means Chairman Bill Thomas propose Sunday on "Meet the Press" that Social Security benefits should be based on race and gender. Chairman Thomas said that Congress "needs to consider how many years of retirement you get based on your race" and that women should receive fewer benefits each year because they tend to live longer than men. Asked if Congress would accept such an idea, Chairman Thomas didn't seem to know the answer.

The answer is "No," Mr. President. We, the undersigned members of Congress, will not accept a Social Security formula that is based on race or gender. This idea is unfair, it is unjust, it is profoundly anti-American. We call on you to repudiate it. We request a meeting with you to give you our views in person and receive your response.

Cutting benefits to those who need them most is counter to the core principles on which Social Security was founded. That great program is the financial safety net for all working Americans in their old age—and all workers are entitled to its benefits regardless of gender or race. Social Security's formulas are race and gender neutral and must remain so. To propose that women should receive fewer benefits because they tend to live longer denies benefits to retired women workers who depend on them to survive and is fundamentally wrong. To advocate that minorities should receive different benefits on the basis of their race is repugnant in a society that has renounced racial discrimination and where all men are equal before the law.

Chairman Thomas' proposal attacks the most vulnerable among us. Retired women workers are twice as likely than men to live below the poverty line and to depend on Social Security as their sole means of support. For African-Americans, Social Security cuts the poverty rate from 59 percent to 21 percent.

Yesterday was not the first time Chairman Thomas has proposed basing Social Security on race and gender, but it was the first time he made clear on national TV that he will advance this outrageous agenda in the Congress. It is time to make clear that Congress will not accept it. Nor should you or your Administration, Chairman Thomas' proposal goes against everything this great nation stands for. It is counter to our deepest moral values. We call on you to renounce clearly and unambiguously any change to Social Security benefits premised on race or gender.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN MALONEY,
Member of Congress.
FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

THE NATIONAL DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that my first address

to this body should be on a large subject, and there are few subjects larger than our national deficit.

The latest reports are forecasting a record \$427 billion deficit, the largest budget deficit in our Nation's history. \$427 billion is an amount so enormous that it is practically impossible for many to put it in context.

The simple fact is that we are spending more money than we are bringing in, and this is digging a hole that we are going to have a hard time getting out of.

This financial irresponsibility is punishing the prosperity for our future generations. When we are unable to pay our bills, we pass that burden on to our children and grandchildren, strapping them with a deficit that grows higher each day.

Mr. Speaker, continuing to run record deficits is dangerous, it is irresponsible, it is reckless; and we have a solemn responsibility to do better than this.

Every time we spend more money than we have or every time we borrow some record amount, we are trading short-term gains for long-term pain.

Before I was elected to Congress, I served 14 years on the Athens-Clarke County Commission. During that time I never once voted to increase taxes, and that is a record I am proud of. Not only that, I put together a perfect record of voting for balanced budgets, year after year; and that is also a record I am proud of.

On the commission, we kept taxes low, we kept the budget balanced, and we made the most out of the people's money. We treated the people's money the same way that working families and small businesses manage their money, we lived within our means.

We always kept one eye on the bottom line and one eye on the road ahead. When we made investments, we invested in the long-term future. When we borrowed money, we borrowed for long-term interests, not simply to pay that month's light bill.

Mr. Speaker, if working families can live within their means, or if a small city council of just 10 members can find a way not to spend more than they have, then the United States Congress ought to be able to do the same thing. It is not rocket science. It is just fiscal common sense and good government public service.

We have many commitments: we must continue to support our troops in the war on terror; we must keep the promise of Social Security; we must find ways to lower the tax burden for all of our working families. But we have to start keeping those commitments by using only the money that we have, without raising taxes and without forcing our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

As we settle into the 109th Congress, we must commit ourselves to a sound policy of deficit reduction. I hope that my colleagues in the House will join me in working together to bring a new

era of fiscal responsibility to this legislative body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY OF INTERVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, what if it was all a big mistake? America's foreign policy of intervention, while still debated in the early 20th century, is today accepted as conventional wisdom by both political parties.

But what if the overall policy is a colossal mistake, a major error in judgment? Not just a bad judgment regarding when and where to impose ourselves, but the entire premise that we have a moral right to meddle in the affairs of others?

Think of the untold harm done by years of fighting, hundreds of thousands of American casualties, hundreds of thousands of foreign civilian casualties and unbelievable human and economic costs. What if it was all needlessly borne by the American people?

If we do conclude that grave foreign policy errors have been made, a very serious question must be asked: What would it take to change our policy to one more compatible with a true republic's goal of peace, commerce and friendship with all nations? Is it not possible that George Washington's admonition to avoid entangling alliances is sound advice even today?

As a physician, I would like to draw an analogy. In medicine, mistakes are made. Man is fallible. Misdiagnoses are made, incorrect treatments are given, and experimental trials of medicine are advocated. A good physician understands the imperfections in medical care, advises close follow-ups and double-checks the diagnoses, treatment and medication. Adjustments are made to assure the best results.

But what if a doctor never checks the success or failure of a treatment or ignores bad results and assumes his omnipotence, refusing to concede that the initial course of treatment was a mistake? Let me assure my colleagues the results would not be good. Litigation

and the loss of reputation in the medical community place restraints on this type of bull-headed behavior.

Sadly, though, when governments, politicians and bureaucrats make mistakes and refuse to examine them, there is little that victims can do to correct things. Since the bully pulpit and the media propaganda machine are instrumental in government cover-ups and deception, the final truth emerges slowly and only after much suffering. The arrogance of some politicians, regulators, and diplomats actually causes them to become even more aggressive and more determined to prove themselves right, to prove their power is not to be messed with by never admitting a mistake. Truly, power corrupts.

The unwillingness to ever reconsider our policy of foreign intervention, despite obvious failures and shortcomings over the last 50 years, has brought great harm to our country and our liberty. Historically, financial realities are the ultimate check on nations bent on empire-building.

Economic laws ultimately prevail over bad judgment, but tragically, the greater the wealth of the country, the longer the flawed policy lasts. We will probably not be any different.

We are still a wealthy Nation and our currency is still trusted by the world. Yet we are vulnerable to some harsh realities about our true wealth and the burden of our future commitments. Overwhelming debt and the precarious nature of the dollar should serve to restrain our determined leaders. Yet they show little concern for our deficits. Rest assured, though, the limitations of our endless foreign adventurism and spending will become apparent to everyone at some point in time.

Since 9/11, a lot of energy and money have gone into efforts ostensibly designed to make us safer. Many laws have been passed. Many dollars have been spent. Whether or not we are better off is another question.

Today, we occupy two countries in the Middle East. We have suffered over 20,000 casualties and caused possibly 100,000 civilian casualties in Iraq.

□ 1415

We have spent over \$200 billion in these occupations, as well as hundreds of billions of dollars here at home hoping to be safer. We have created the Department of Homeland Security, passed the PATRIOT Act, and created a new super CIA agency. Our government is now permitted to monitor the Internet, read our mail, search us without proper search warrants, to develop a national ID card, and to investigate what people are reading in libraries. Ironically, illegal aliens flow into our country and qualify for driver's licenses and welfare benefits with little restraint.

These issues are discussed, but nothing has been as highly visible to us as the authoritarianism we accept at the airports. The creation of the Transportation Security Administration has intruded on the privacy of all airline

travelers, and there is little evidence that we are safer for it. Driven by fear, we have succumbed to the age-old temptation to sacrifice liberty on the pretense of obtaining security.

Love of security, unfortunately, all too often vanquishes love of liberty. Unchecked fear of another 9/11-type attack constantly preoccupies our leaders and most of our citizens and drives the legislative attack on our civil liberties. It is frightening to see us doing to ourselves what even bin Laden never dreamed he could accomplish with his suicide bombers.

We do not understand the difference between a vague threat of terrorism and the danger of a guerilla war. One prompts us to expand and nationalize domestic law enforcement while limiting the freedoms of all Americans. The other deals with understanding terrorists like bin Laden who declared war against us in 1998. Not understanding the difference makes it virtually impossible to deal with the real threats.

We are obsessed with passing new laws to make our country safe from a terrorist attack. This confusion about the cause of the 9/11 attacks, the fear they engendered, and the willingness to sacrifice liberty prompts many to declare their satisfaction with the inconveniences and even humiliation at our Nation's airports.

There are always those in government who are anxious to increase its power and authority over the people. Strict adherence to personal privacy annoys those who promote a centralized state. It is no surprise to learn that many of the new laws passed in the aftermath of 9/11 had been proposed long before that date. The attacks merely provided an excuse to do many things previously proposed by dedicated statist.

All too often government acts perversely, promising to advance liberty while actually doing the opposite. Dozens of new bills passed since 9/11 promise to protect our freedoms and our securities. In time we will realize there is little chance our security will be enhanced or our liberties protected. The powerful and intrusive TSA certainly will not solve our problems. Without a full discussion, greater understanding, and ultimately a change in our foreign policy that incites those who declare war against us, no amount of pat-downs at airports will suffice.

Imagine the harm done, the staggering costs and the loss of liberty if in the next 20 years airplanes are never again employed by terrorists. Even if there is a possibility that airplanes will be used to terrorize us, TSA's bullying will do little to prevent it. Patting down old women and little kids in airports cannot possibly make us safer. TSA cannot protect us from another attack, and it is not the solution. It serves only to make us more obedient and complacent toward government intrusion in our lives.

The airplane mess has been compounded by other problems which we

fail to recognize. Most assume that government has the greatest responsibility for making private aircraft travel safe. But this assumption only ignores mistakes made before 9/11, when the government taught us to not resist, taught us that airline personnel could not carry guns, and that the government would be in charge of security. Airline owners became complacent and dependent on the government.

After 9/11, we moved in the wrong direction by allowing total government control and political takeover of the TSA, which was completely contrary to the proposition that private owners have the ultimate responsibility to protect their customers.

Discrimination laws passed during the last 40 years ostensibly fueled the Transportation Secretary's near obsession with avoiding the appearance of discriminating against young Muslim males. Instead, TSA seemingly targeted white children and old women. We have failed to recognize that a safety policy by a private airline is quite a different thing from government agents blindly obeying antidiscrimination laws.

Governments do not have a right to use blanket discrimination such as that which led to the incarceration of Japanese Americans in World War II. However, local law enforcement agencies should be able to target their searches if the description of a suspect is narrowed by sex, race or religion. But we are dealing with an entirely different matter when it comes to safety on airplanes. The Federal Government should not be involved in local law enforcement and has no right to discriminate.

Airlines, on the other hand, should be permitted to do whatever is necessary to provide safety. Private firms, long denied this right, should have a right to discriminate. Fine restaurants, for example, can require that shoes and shirts be worn for service in their establishments. The logic of this remaining property right should permit more sensible security checks at airports. The airlines should be responsible for the safety of their property and liable for it as well. This is not only the responsibility of the airlines, but it is a civil right that has long been denied them and other private companies.

The present situation requires the government to punish some by targeting those individuals who clearly offer no threat. Any airline that tries to make travel safer and happens to question a larger number of young Muslim males than the government deems appropriate can be assessed huge fines. To add insult to injury, the fines collected from the airlines are used to force sensitivity training on pilots, who do their very best under the circumstances to make flying safer by restricting the travel of some individuals.

We have embarked on a process that serves no logical purpose. While airline safety suffers, personal liberty is diminished, and costs skyrocket.

Mr. Speaker, if we are willing to consider a different foreign policy, we should ask ourselves a few questions:

What if the policies of foreign intervention, entangling alliances, policing the world, nation-building, and spreading our values through force are deeply flawed?

What if it is true that Saddam Hussein never had weapons of mass destruction?

What if it is true that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were never allies?

What if it is true that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein did nothing to enhance our national security?

What if our current policy in the Middle East leads to the overthrow of our client oil states in that region?

What if the American people really knew that more than 20,000 American troops have suffered serious casualties or died in the Iraq war, and 9 percent of our forces already have been made incapable of returning to battle?

What if it turns out there are many more guerilla fighters in Iraq than our government admits?

What if there really have been 100,000 civilian Iraqi casualties, as some claim; and what is an acceptable price for doing good?

What if Secretary Rumsfeld is replaced for the wrong reasons, and things become worse under a defense secretary who demands more troops and an expansion of the war?

What if we discover that when they do vote, the overwhelming majority of Iraqis support Islamic law over Western secular law and want our troops removed?

What if those who correctly warned of the disaster awaiting us in Iraq are never asked for their opinion of what should be done now?

What if the only solution for Iraq is to divide the country into three separate regions, recognizing the principle of self-determination while rejecting the artificial boundaries created in 1918 by non-Iraqis?

What if it turns out radical Muslims do not hate us for our freedoms, but rather for our policies in the Middle East that directly affected Arabs and Muslims?

What if the invasion and occupation of Iraq actually distracted from pursuing and capturing Osama bin Laden?

What if we discover that democracy cannot be spread with force of arms?

What if democracy is deeply flawed and, instead, we should be talking about liberty, property rights, free markets, the rule of law, localized government, weak centralized government, and self-determination promoted through persuasion, not force?

What if Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda actually welcomed our invasion and occupation of an Arab-Muslim Iraq as proof of their accusations against us, and it served as a magnificent recruiting tool for them?

What if our policy greatly increased and prolonged our vulnerability to ter-

rorists and guerilla attacks both at home and abroad?

What if the Pentagon, as reported by its Defense Science Board, actually recognized the dangers of our policy before the invasion, and their warnings were ignored or denied?

What if the argument that by fighting over there we will not have to fight here is wrong, and the opposite is true?

What if we can never be safer by giving up some of our freedoms?

What if the principle of preemptive war is adopted by Russia, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and others, and justified by current U.S. policy?

What if preemptive war and preemptive guilt stem from the same flawed policy of authoritarianism, though we fail to recognize it?

What if Pakistan is not a trustworthy ally and turns on us when conditions deteriorate?

What if plans are being laid to provoke Syria and/or Iran into actions that would be used to justify a military response and preemptive war against them?

What if our policy of democratization of the Middle East fails and ends up fueling a Russian-Chinese alliance that we regret; an alliance not achieved even at the height of the Cold War?

What if the policy forbidding profiling at our borders and airports is deeply flawed?

What if presuming the guilt of a suspected terrorist without a trial leads to the total undermining of constitutional protections for American citizens when arrested?

What if we discover the Army is too small to continue policies of preemption and nation-building?

What if a military draft is the only way to mobilize enough troops?

What if the stop-loss program is actually an egregious violation of trust and a breach of contract between the government and soldiers; what if this is actually a back-door draft, leading to unbridled cynicism and rebellion against a voluntary army and generating support for a draft of both men and women? Will lying to troops lead to rebellion and anger toward the political leaderships running this war?

What if the Pentagon's legal task force opinion that the President is not bound by international or Federal law regarding torture stands unchallenged and sets a precedent which ultimately harms Americans while totally disregarding the moral, practical, and legal arguments against such a policy?

What if the intelligence reform legislation which gives us a bigger, more expensive bureaucracy does not bolster our security, distracts us from the real problem of revamping our interventionist foreign policy?

□ 1430

What if we suddenly discover we are the aggressors and we are losing an unwinnable guerilla war? What if we discover too late that we cannot afford this war, and that our policies have led

to a dollar collapse, rampant inflation, high interest rates, and a severe economic downturn?

Mr. Speaker, why do I believe these are such important questions? Because the number one function of the Federal Government is to provide for national security. And national security has been severely undermined.

On 9/11 we had a grand total of 14 aircraft to protect the entire U.S. mainland, all of which proved useless that day. We have an annual DOD budget of over \$400 billion, most of which is spent overseas in over 100 different countries.

Tragically, on 9/11 our Air Force was better positioned to protect Seoul, Tokyo, Berlin and London than it was to protect Washington, D.C. and New York City. Moreover, our ill advised presence in the Middle East and our decade-long bombing of Iraq served only to incite the suicidal attacks of 9/11.

Before 9/11 our CIA ineptly pursued bin Laden, whom the Taliban was protecting. At the same time, the Taliban was receiving significant support from Pakistan, our trusted ally that received millions of dollars from the United States. We allied ourselves both with bin Laden and Hussein in the 1980s, only to regret it in the 1990s. And it is safe to say we have used billions of U.S. dollars in the last 50 years pursuing this contradictory, irrational, foolish, costly and very dangerous foreign policy.

Policing the world, spreading democracy by force, nation-building and frequent bombing of countries that pose no threat to us, while leaving the homeland and our borders unprotected, result from a foreign policy that is contradictory and not in our self-interest.

I can hardly expect anyone in Washington to pay much attention to my concerns. But if I am completely wrong in my criticism, nothing is lost except my time and energy expended in efforts to get others to reconsider our foreign policy.

But the bigger question is, what if I am right, or even partially right, and we urgently need to change course in our foreign policy for the sake of our national and economic security, yet no one pays attention?

For that, a price will be paid. Is it not worth talking about?

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the House Committee on International Relations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this letter as my resignation, as of this date, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations. I have appreciated the opportunity to serve as a member of this

committee and have enjoyed my eight years of service.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. MCHUGH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AF- FAIRS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Effective today, January 26, 2005, I am resigning from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RICK G. RENZI,
*U.S. Congressman,
1st District of Arizona.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COM- MITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
Mr. CUNNINGHAM, California
Mr. EVERETT, Alabama
Mr. GALLEGLY, California
Mrs. WILSON, New Mexico
Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia,
Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas
Mr. MCHUGH, New York
Mr. TIAHRT, Kansas
Mr. ROGERS, Michigan
Mr. RENZI, Arizona
Mr. HASTINGS, Florida
Mr. REYES, Texas
Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa
Mr. CRAMER, Alabama
Ms. ESHOO, California
Mr. HOLT, New Jersey
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. TIERNEY, Massachusetts

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 25 and today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BIGGERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARROW, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

321. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Change in the Minimum Maturity Requirements for Fresh Grapefruit [Docket No. FV05-905-1 IFR] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

322. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2004-2005 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV05-982-1 IFR] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

323. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Poultry Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Voluntary Shell Egg Grading Regulations — Facilities and Equipment [Docket No. PY-03-005] (RIN: 0581-AC33) received January 7, 2005,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

324. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock and Seed Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lamb Promotion and Research Program: Procedures for the Conduct of a Referendum [No. LS-04-06] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

325. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [Docket No. AO-388-A16, AO-356-A38, and AO-366-A45; DA-04-07] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV05-959-1 IFR] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

327. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantines Areas [Docket No. 02-125-2] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

328. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning; Removal of 2000 Planning Rule (RIN: 0596-AB86) received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

329. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

330. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the DoD anticipates it will be prepared to commence chemical agent destruction operations at the Pine Bluff Chemical Agent Disposal Facility in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

331. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

332. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5852; to the Committee on International Relations.

333. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-638, "Captive Insurance Company Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

334. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-612, "Approval of Starpower Communications, LLC's Open Video System Franchise Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

335. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 15-631, "Freedom of Information Legislative Records Clarification Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

336. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-606, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Police Department Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

337. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-636, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Revitalization Projects Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

338. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-607, "Rehabilitation Services Program Establishment Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

339. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-608, "Extension of Time to Dispose of Property for Golden Rule Development Project Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

340. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-603, "Debarment Procedures Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

341. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-633, "Ceremonial Funds Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

342. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-604, "Parking Meter Fee Moratorium Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

343. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-605, "Towing Regulation and Enforcement Authority Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-634, "Felony Sexual Assault Statute of Limitations Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

345. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-597, "District of Columbia Emancipation Day Parade and Fund Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

346. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-635, "Producer Summary Suspension Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

347. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-598, "Television Production Studios and Equipment Use Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

348. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 15-611, "Closing of Public Alleys in Square 2674, S.O. 01-2426, Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

349. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-599, "Documents Administrative Cost Assessment Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

350. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-637, "Omnibus Juvenile Justice Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

351. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-610, "District of Columbia Government Purchase Card Program Reporting Requirements Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

352. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-632, "Business Improvement Districts and Anacostia Waterfront Corporation Clarification Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

353. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-600, "Closing of a Portion of the Intersection of Minnesota Avenue and East Capitol Street, N.E., S.O. 02-3743, Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

354. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-601, "Unemployment Compensation Additional Funds Appropriation Authorization Temporary Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

355. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-602, "Citizens with Mental Retardation Substituted Consent of Health Care Decisions Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

356. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-609, "Automated Traffic Enforcement Fund Temporary Amendment Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

357. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

358. A letter from the Secretary, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act covering the calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

359. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

360. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

361. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmit-

ting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

362. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

363. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

364. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

365. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, International Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

366. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270) and OMB Circular A-76, Performance of Commercial Activities, the Administration's FY 2004 inventory of commercial activities performed by federal employees and inventory of inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

367. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Foundation's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

368. A letter from the Deputy Director for Administration and Information Management, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Office's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

369. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

370. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

371. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

372. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

373. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

374. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

375. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a

report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

376. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

377. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

378. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

379. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

380. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

381. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 feet (18.3 m) Length Overall and Longer Using Hook-and-line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 120904A] received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

382. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New York [Docket No. 031119283-4001-02; I.D. 121404B] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

383. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Bluefish Fishery [Docket No. 021122284-2323-02; I.D. 122204G] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

384. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the Fall Commercial Red Snapper Component [I.D. 112604A] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

385. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Processor Vessels Using Hook and Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 120204A] received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

386. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Total Allowable Catch Harvested for Management

Area 1B [Docket No. 021101264-3016-02; I.D. 120304C] received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

387. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 112304C] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

388. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Restrictions for 2004 Purse Seine and Longline Fisheries in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean [Docket No. 040617186-4302; I.D. 120704A] received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

389. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 122704C] received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

390. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 120704C] received December 29, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

391. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands [Docket No. 041104307-4356-02; I.D. 102904B] (RIN: 0648-AS56) received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

392. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Interim 2005 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 041202339-4339-01; I.D. 112204D] received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

393. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery [Docket No. 041018283-4340-02; I.D. 102204C] (RIN: 0648-AS81) received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

394. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 40-A [Docket No. 040804229-4300-02; I.D. 080204G] (RIN: 0648-AS34) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

395. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revision of Stellar Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Pollock and Pacific Cod Fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 040907255-4343-02; I.D. 082704E] (RIN: 0648-AS41) received December 29, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

396. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting The results of a study to examine state barriers to the adoption and implementation of state programs for the use of communications systems along highways for alerts for the recovery of abducted children, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5791b Public Law 108-21, section 303(i)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

397. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Yamhill-Carlton District Viticultural Area (2002R-216R) [TTB T.D.-20; Re: Notice No. 19] (RIN: 1513-AA59) received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Southern Oregon Viticultural Area (2002R-338P) [TTB T.D.-19; Re: Notice No. 17] (RIN: 1513-AA75) received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

399. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, ACF, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child Support Enforcement Program; Reasonable Quantitative Standard for Review and Adjustment of Child Support Orders — received December 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-3) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

401. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-8) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Gross Estate; Election to Value on Alternate Valuation Date [TD 9172] (RIN: 1545-BB12) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

403. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-4) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Substantial Understatement of Income Tax Liability [TD 9174] (RIN: 1545-BD75) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2004-82] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

406. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-1) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

407. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Automatic Rollover [Notice 2005-5] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

408. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Prohibited Allocations of Securities in an S Corporation [TD 9164] (RIN: 1545-BC33) received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

409. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Reduction of Penalty for Understating Tax by Adequate Disclosure of an Item on Return (Rev. Proc. 2004-73) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

410. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Automatic Extension of Time to File Certain Information Returns and Exempt Organization Returns [TD 9163] (RIN: 1545-BB29) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Publication of the Tier 2 Tax Rates — received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

412. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Regulations Governing Practice Before the Internal Revenue Service [TD 9165] (RIN: 1545-BA70) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

413. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guidelines — received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

414. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Allocation of national limitation for qualified zone academy bonds for year 2005 (Rev. Proc. 2004-72) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

415. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Public Hearings on the Advance Pricing Agreement Program (Announcement 2004-98) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

416. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal

Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, first-out inventories, (Rev. Rul. 2004-113) received December 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

417. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2005-9) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

418. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2005-2) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

419. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Student FICA Exception [TD 9167] (RIN: 1545-BC81) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

420. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Optional 10-Year Writeoff of Certain Tax Preferences [TD 9168] (RIN: 1545-BC13) received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

421. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability. (Rev. Proc. 2005-10) received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

422. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Under Sec. 409A of the Internal Revenue Code [Notice 2005-1] received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

423. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Closing agreements (Rev. Proc. 2005-12) received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

424. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Final Regulations for Health Coverage Portability for Group Health Plans and Group Health Insurance under HIPAA Title I & IV [TD 9166] (RIN: 1545-AX84) received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

425. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2004 Cumulative List of Changes in Plan Qualification Requirements [Notice 2004-84] received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

426. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Authority to charge fees for furnishing copies of exempt organizations' material open to public inspection. [TD 9173] (RIN: 1545-BB22) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

427. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Election to Determine Corporate Tax on Certain International Shipping Activities Under Tonnage Tax Regime [Notice 2005-2] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

428. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-5) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

429. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters. (Rev. Proc. 2005-6) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

430. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Areas in which Rulings in the International Area will not be issued. (Rev. Proc. 2005-7) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

431. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability. (Rev. Proc. 2005-2) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

432. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Retirement plans; Cash or deferred arrangements under section 401(k) and matching contributions or employee contributions under section 401(m) Regulations [TD 9169] (RIN: 1545-AX26) received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — New Markets Tax Credit [TD 9171] (RIN: 1545-AY87) received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

434. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Taxes of Foreign Countries and of Possessions of United States. (Rev. Rul. 2005-3) received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

435. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Publication of the Tier 2 Tax Rates — received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

436. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Fuel Tax Guidance; Request for Public Comments [Notice 2005-04] received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

437. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 1374 Effective Dates [TD 9170] (RIN: 1545-BD99) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

438. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Services performed by certain students in the employ of a school, college, or university, or of a nonprofit organization auxiliary to a school, college, or university (Rev. Proc. 2005-11) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

439. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Detailed compilation of data concerning Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for FY 2002, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8629(b); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 366. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 367. A bill to make permanent the teacher loan forgiveness provisions of the Teacher-Taxpayer Protection Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 368. A bill to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 369. A bill to provide for greater recognition of Veterans Day each year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate that part or all of any income tax refund be paid over for use in biomedical research conducted through the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 371. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of all contact lenses as medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOYD:

H.R. 372. A bill to include in St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge, Florida, the land and facilities comprising St. Marks lighthouse; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 373. A bill to require notification to Congress of certain contracts, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized expenditure of funds for publicity or propaganda purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 374. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain tribally-owned reservation land into trust for the Puyallup Tribe; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 375. A bill to declare, under the authority of Congress under Article I, section 8 of the Constitution to "provide and maintain a Navy", a national policy for the naval force structure required in order to "provide for the common defense" of the United States throughout the 21st century; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. EMANUEL):

H.R. 376. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate fair prices for Medicare prescription drugs on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 377. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve death benefits for the families of deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 378. A bill to establish a program to assist homeowners experiencing unavoidable, temporary difficulty making payments on mortgages insured under the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 379. A bill to ensure equal protection and due process of law in capital punishment cases by imposing a moratorium on the imposition and carrying out of the death penalty in certain States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JINDAL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. BOYD, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MEEK of

Florida, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H.R. 380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain hazard mitigation assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 381. A bill to clarify congressional approval of certain State energy production tax practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 382. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to designate certain counties and a city as part of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 383. A bill to designate the Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 384. A bill to prohibit the operation during a calendar year of the final rule issued by the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for the designation of minimal-risk regions for the introduction of bovine spongiform encephalopathy into the United States, including designation of Canada as a minimal-risk region, and the importation into the United States from Canada of certain bovine ruminant products during that calendar year, unless country of origin labeling is required for the retail sale of a covered commodity during that calendar year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a \$1,000 refundable credit for individuals who are active members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. REYES, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 386. A bill to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JINDAL (for himself, Mr. MCCREERY, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude disaster mitigation payments from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 388. A bill to provide for a Biofuels Feedstocks Energy Reserve, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and guarantee loans for the production, distribution, development, and storage of biofuels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FOLEY, Mr.

GOODE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 389. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centenary of the bestowal of the Nobel Peace Prize on President Theodore Roosevelt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. CARSON):

H.R. 390. A bill to amend the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the delivery of payments under the program to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 391. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the remaining water supply storage allocation in Rathbun Lake, Iowa, to the Rathbun Regional Water Association; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 392. A bill to establish a grant program to enhance the financial and retirement literacy of mid-life and older Americans and to reduce financial abuse and fraud among such Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 393. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to notify the Congress of any shortfall in funding for the tenant-based rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 394. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a boundary study to evaluate the significance of the Colonel James Barrett Farm in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of the Minute Man National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 395. A bill to adjust the boundary of Lowell National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 396. A bill to provide assistance for early warning systems in foreign countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr.

HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 397. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance to children who are orphaned or unaccompanied as a result of the tsunamis that occurred on December 26, 2004, in the Indian Ocean; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 398. A bill to provide for full voting representation in Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 400. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Western Cotton Research Laboratory in Phoenix, Arizona, to the nonprofit organizations that originally provided the real property for the laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a full tax deduction for higher education expenses and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Hope Scholarship Credit to be used for elementary and secondary expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to charitable organizations which provide elementary or secondary school scholarships and for contributions of, and for, instructional materials and materials for extracurricular activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H.R. 405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for professional school personnel in grades kindergarten through grade 12; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 406. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 407. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available transportation on Department of Defense aircraft for an individual who is a surviving spouse or dependent child of a member of the Armed Forces who died on active duty when that individual is traveling with a relative of the deceased member who is otherwise eligible for such space-available transportation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 408. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for portal-to-portal compensation for wildland firefighters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 409. A bill to provide for the exchange of land within the Sierra National Forest, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 410. A bill to provide for a land exchange in the State of Arizona between the Secretary of Agriculture and Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 411. A bill to recognize the importance of livestock ranching to the history and continued economic vitality of the western United States and to compensate ranchers when certain Government actions result in the loss or reduction in animal unit months authorized under a grazing permit or lease issued by a Federal land management agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Western Reserve Heritage Area; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H.R. 413. A bill to establish the Bleeding Kansas and the Enduring Struggle for Freedom National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DELAULO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 415. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct access to audiologists for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 416. A bill to prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds for any study related to the transportation of chemical munitions across State lines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 417. A bill to provide incentives for investment in research and development for new medicines, to enhance access to new medicines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. COX, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTNECHT, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 418. A bill to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Government Reform, for a

period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 419. A bill to extend the operation of the President's National Hire Veterans Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself,

Mr. DELAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 420. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 421. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of stipends to veterans who pursue doctoral degrees in science or technology; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 422. A bill to provide for counterproliferation measures; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 423. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish an Advanced Power System Technology Incentives Program to fund the development and deployment of new advanced technologies such as advanced fuel cells, turbines, or hybrid power systems or power storage systems to generate or store electric energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for certain energy efficient property placed in service or installed in an existing principal residence or property used by businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 425. A bill to establish a grant and fee program through the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage and promote the recycling of used computers and to promote the development of a national infrastructure for the recycling of used computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 426. A bill to encourage the development and integrated use by the public and private sectors of remote sensing and other geospatial information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 427. A bill to require Federal agencies to develop and implement policies and practices that promote environmental justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BEAUPREZ):

H.R. 428. A bill to better provide for compensation for certain persons injured in the course of employment at the Rocky Flats site in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 429. A bill to reauthorize additional contract authority for States with Indian reservations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REYES, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to identify a route that passes through the States of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Kansas as a high priority corridor on the National Highway System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution to commemorate the spirit of Cesar E. Chavez: "Si Se Puede"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding regulations on the amounts of expenditures of personal funds made by candidates for election for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established a School Zone Safety Awareness Week to encourage schools, government, parents, and businesses in the United States to educate children and adults about safety in our Nation's school zones; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution supporting the designation of a week as "Extension Living Well Week"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. WATT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to human rights in Central Asia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution urging the President take immediate steps to establish a plan to adopt the recommendations of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission in its 2004 Report to the Congress in order to correct the current imbalance in the bilateral trade and economic relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhaian, a leader of Sikhs, and expressing condolences to the Sikh community on his passing; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FARR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should develop and implement a plan to begin the immediate withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio:

H. Res. 48. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 49. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 50. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELAY:

H. Res. 51. A resolution amending the Rules of the House relating to the composition of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Miss McMORRIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. BAIRD):

H. Res. 52. A resolution congratulating the Seattle Storm for winning the 2004 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Miss McMORRIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. BAIRD):

H. Res. 53. A resolution congratulating Ichiro Suzuki for breaking the Major League Baseball record for hits in a single season; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 54. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding anti-Semitism at the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 55. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Rotary International; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

4. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 241 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to explore what steps might be necessary to stabilize the steel market in this country in order to ensure the availability of this raw material for domestic market needs and help contain escalating prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 431. A bill for the relief of Flavia Maboloc Cahoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. TANCREDI):

H.R. 432. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to permit continued occupancy and use of certain lands and improvements within Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 63: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 64: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. POE, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 95: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 114: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 127: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 128: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 135: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 136: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 147: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEK of

Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FORD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 196: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. GINNY GROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 224: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 225: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 240: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 289: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.

H.R. 292: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WU, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 296: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 304: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 356: Mr. PENCE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 358: Mr. REYES, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. CHABOT.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 17: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H. Res. 21: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 22: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Res. 40: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. CARSON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 111: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors, Warren County, Lake George, New York, relative to Resolution No. 804 supporting H.R. 4790, authorizing importation of prescription drugs from Canada and certain other countries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5. Also, a petition of Wampanoag Nation Tribe of Grayhead, Wolf Band, Utah, relative to notice that the Wampanoag Nation, Tribe of Grayhead, Wolf Band, have organized for

their common welfare; to the Committee on Resources.

6. Also, a petition of Mr. Albert Bethea, a Citizen of Cleveland, Ohio, relative to a letter discussing a legal matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. Also, a petition of Mr. James M. Lampe, a Citizen of the State of Hawaii, relative to a notice of fraud, and petitioning the United States Congress for redress of grievances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.